

# The Leader

"The one Idea which History exhibits as evermore developing itself into greater distinctness is the Idea of Humanity—the noble endeavour to throw down all the barriers erected between men by prejudice and one-sided views; and by setting aside the distinctions of Religion, Country, and Colour, to treat the whole Human race as one brotherhood, having one great object—the free development of our spiritual nature."—HUMBOLDT'S COSMOS.

## Contents :

News of the Week—	Page	The Norwich Murder.....	699	Social Reform.—Explanation to	704	The Opera.....	710
Parliament of the Week .....	694	Personal News and Gossip .....	699	Summary of the Objections .....	704	Gilda .....	711
The Friends of Italy .....	696	Criminal Conversation, Divorc., &c. ....	700	LITERATURE—		ORGANIZATION OF THE PEOPLE—	
The Clergyman at the Crystal Pa-		Labour Affray .....	700	Mr. Gladstone's Letters .....	706	H. Russell's Petition .....	711
lace .....	697	Jewish Oaths .....	700	Recent Novels .....	707	OPEN COUNCIL—	
French Politics.—Defeat of Minis-		PUBLIC AFFAIRS—		Liebig's Chemical Letters .....	707	"Malthus Again" .....	712
ters .....	697	Gladstone the Witness .....	702	Books on our Table .....	708	Cult in Scotland .....	712
Persecutions of Freiligrath: our		How to push Reform for "Next		PORTFOLIO—		Marriage with a Deceased Wife	
Prussian Allies .....	698	Session" .....	703	Extraordinary Occurrences at a re-		Sister .....	713
The Peace Congress at Exeterhall .....	698	Privileges of a Gentleman .....	703	cent Bal Masque .....	709	COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS—	
The late Dr. Lingard .....	699	Realities .....	703	THE ARTS—		Markets, Gazette, Advertisements,	
The case of Ann Hicks .....	699	Mr. Coningham at Brighton .....	701	Angelo .....	709	&c.....	713-16

VOL. II.—No. 70.

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1851.

PRICE 6d.

## News of the Week.

THE contest about Alderman Salomons in the Commons, the contest about the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill in the Lords—those have been the leading subjects of the week in Parliament. The Commons spent Friday in discussing the case of Mr. Salomons, Monday, Tuesday, and again adjourned to Friday. No real progress seems to have been made on either side. The position taken by Mr. Salomons differs from that of the Baron de Rothschild, in his assuming that he is right, acting upon that assumption, and braving consequences. He did not, as many at first supposed, follow up the genuine taking of the oath by the offer to take it pro forma, with the surplage prescribed, avowing that he uttered the words only as a form; but he took the oath exactly as it had been taken by the Baron, and afterwards he sat, spoke, and voted. He was assailed with cries of "Order," with indignant speeches from the opponents of Lord John Russell's bill, with disclaimers by Lord John himself, with motions of censure, prohibition, and expulsion; but no party then and there threatened to take the initiative in prosecuting him. Lord John Russell moved a resolution, declaring that, not having taken the oath, he could not sit; and Mr. George Thompson moved an amendment, pledging the House to alter the oath; but the debate has been adjourned.

Meantime, the Baron de Rothschild has backed his friend, by a public meeting in the City. The City has shown much spirit in this matter before, and has called upon Lord John to make the admission of its own Member a Cabinet question.

The lordly debate on the Papal aggression has made still less way. With one or two remarkable exceptions, the speeches may be described as a more calm and compact recitation of the arguments so much used in the House of Commons. Lord Lansdowne's rehearsal of the best arguments in favour of the bill was of that kind. The Earl of Aberdeen presented the case on the other side with great clearness, showing that the aggression was not of a kind to demand counter-aggression; that if it did, the bill was not calculated to afford such counter-aggression; and that the Ministerial conduct, with its extravagances, its vacillations, its provocatives and concessions, was itself a censure on the measure. The Duke of Newcastle showed that the Papal bull must have been anticipated; and, indeed, Lord Minto let out that he knew of Cardinal Wiseman's elevation before he went to Rome! Lord Lyndhurst, author of the Relief Act of '46-7, who introduced that measure with an explanation that it was intended to permit the introduction of bulls in order to the appointment of bishops, added himself to the list of those who adopt Lord John's last gross

[TOWN EDITION.]

inconsistency. We are not disposed to criticize Lord Lyndhurst's conduct—not because age has dimmed his faculties, for we believe that they are still bright and vigorous, but because a man so bowed down by time must feel, above all things, responsible to his conscience, and almost irresponsible to anything else. Lord Beaumont, who occupies the unintelligible position of a Roman Catholic supporting the bill on grounds of Roman Catholic policy, as necessary to the independence of Catholics in England—a Protestant protection against the Pope!—can plead no such exemption; indeed we do not see what plea he can lay before his fellow Catholics, except, perchance, that he has absolute from the Duke of Norfolk.

A little wrangling about the Church of England in the Colonies, during the discussion of supply, drew from Mr. Gladstone the announcement that next session he should introduce a bill to regulate and fortify the hierarchical discipline of the Church in the Colonies.

A question of very great importance—and, if the House of Commons look at the moral and intellectual aspects of it, of great interest—has been brought forward by Lord Dudley Stuart. We allude to the motion of the noble lord on the treatment of Mr. Ernest Jones in prison. The ancient theory of religious persecution, which punished offences of conscience with more ignominy than felonies, long ago exploded as a blot on civilized jurisprudence, is revived in political imprisonments. Mr. Bouvier tells us that English law recognizes no distinctions between political and criminal offenders, which comes out in the end thus—that political opinion may be worse punished than criminal acts, because the prejudices of magistrates lead them to revenge defeat on the platform, by retaliation when they have succeeded in putting their opponents in gaol. The theory of our law on this point is grossly immoral, and must foment the darkest passions. The defence, too, of the law is no whit better than its theory. Mr. Jones feels himself bound to resent the indignity put upon him by compelling him to pick oakum, and he refused to purchase exemption, which would have admitted the rightfulness of the indignity put upon him. Mr. Bouvier says, "It appeared that Mr. Jones preferred to be persecuted, because he would not pay or allow any money to be paid, to relieve him from this labour." This is an interpretation, but Parliamentary we suppose, as neither the Speaker nor any Member rebuked it; but it is brutal and disingenuous notwithstanding. Are these to be the lessons of senators to the people?

The Peace Congress has assembled in great force at Exeter Hall, and has carried its resolutions with a bloodless victory; no enemy appearing. The difficulty is to understand how, with whatever semblance of unanimity, speakers and politicians so different in their actions, can be at one in their ideas: how can David Brewster, Emile de Girardin, Cobden, Victor Hugo, and John Burnet interpret

"peace" in the same way? Practically, the Congress appears to make no advance; it has as yet established no machinery; it tried its hand on Schleswig-Holstein—flat experimentum—and that country has been handed back to the absolute power of Denmark.

In the French Assembly, as we foresaw, revision has proved impossible. The party of Order have been signally defeated; the majority have been routed; Imperialist, Fusionist, Legitimist—all have been frustrated.

The officials of the French Republic number at least 500,000, all directly appointed by the Government. The Prefects of the Departments are Royalists or Imperialists; and the general officers who hold commands in the army, belong to the same factions. The Republic has no servants, and yet it cannot be overthrown. Within the last week, the Ministry have been twice defeated; once when the revision was rejected by a majority numbering ninety more than that required by the Constitution; and again when 333 to 320 decided that the Minister of the Interior had unduly interfered in "getting up" the famous petition movement for revision. It is a great triumph for the friends of Continental liberty.

The Party of Order have demonstrated three things before the eyes of Europe. First, they have shown that the disorderly party in the Assembly do not sit solely on the Mountain; that insult, fury, and turbulence are rampant on the Right, when their schemes break down under them. Secondly, the debate has shown that M. Dupin, the pet President of the Party of Order, grows more partial, flippant, and insulting! He exhorted the disputants to calmness, and he interrupted them with unseemly puns. He called Victor Hugo to order for his attack upon those who, prone upon their faces, listened for the sound of the Russian cannon; and he suffered M. Baroche to go scot free, when he denounced the Constituent Assembly. Thirdly, the Party of Order, unable longer to endure the great indictment of their policy and practices, day after day developed at the tribune, impatient of that chastisement they have so often administered to others, and taking refuge in their overwhelming majority, put an end to the debate before little more than half the chief speakers had addressed the Assembly. Yes; *la clôture* was pronounced; the minority were gagged; this was itself a confession of defeat. For them it was time: never, since the 24th of February, 1848, has the hall of the Assembly rung with such powerful words in defence of human freedom.

This defeat leaves the question still open; leaves the eventualities of the future unprovided for; leaves the constitutional demise of the Legislature and Executive possible—with the law of the 31st of May unrepealed; leaves unchecked the hazards of coups-de-main; and also leaves the people free to take the initiative, if need be. Thus the matter is handed over to 1852.

M. Thiers is coming to London, possibly already come. Count Buol Schauenstein is also in London. Count Buol Schauenstein has been mixed up in almost all the Continental diplomatic arrangements of reaction for the last three years. Couple this with other facts. M. Thiers goes from London to Vienna. The German sovereigns contemplate a meeting in Vienna next month. The Russian Minister at Vienna is an active personage, and under his auspices have been made the arrangements aforesaid. Mischief is in the wind.

The treatment of Freiligrath, whose powers of establishing his citizenship have practically been worn out by a powerful and unjust Government; the exile of the hunted Bakoonin, pursued by many crowned conspirators; the coercion of Turkey to detain Kossuth; the treatment of Naples, described by Mr. Gladstone, to its thousands of political prisoners—made prisoners for thinking, or even for suspicion of thinking: these are problems for the peace-men to consider. Are we to wait for the conversion of these emperors and kings, with their councillors and diplomats, their spies and armies, their Croats and Cossacks? Their question will be settled long before they are brought over by preaching or logic.

To come nearer home. The peace-men would have some difficulty in pacifying the brick-makers of Rusholme, who are defending their wages against a continual abatement—which means, defending their existence, by combination and rioting, against masters and nobsticks; and there would be as much difficulty in pacifying the masters, who are defending their property, their Free-trade in labour, their profits—which means, their very existence in the struggle of competition, and who are waging their defence with fire-arms and the terror of the law.

It would be a blessing if peace principles could be introduced into some English homes. See how the law has been summoned to tear the veil of privacy from domestic life—to expose the doubts, the passions, the discords—and yet in how few cases showing us the real truth. In Webster's divorce case, you marvel at the incautiousness displayed by those who would be supposed to have most at stake, and you only learn enough to know that more remains which would be necessary to a thorough understanding; in the Faulkner case of criminal conversation, the evidence bears hardest upon the accuser, but is ugly enough all round; in the Boughey breach of promise case, you have a doubt whether the gentleman could not give a better explanation than that which his counsel thought suited to a court of law; in the police case of Berrington, it is evident that some strange tragedy of confusion is untold. In the case of Winteringham, at Cambridge, his counsel defends him by arguing, that girls in the "situation" of Elizabeth Parr, that is, comparatively humble, must expect to be besieged by undergraduates. How otherwise should the young nobility and gentry be able to sow their wild oats, and complete their curriculum in our ancient seats of learning? Though why, if that necessity is recognized, proctors should go about at night, arresting any ladies who are not walking fast, lest the undergraduates should be tempted to lose their virtue, we cannot understand. Prendergast and proctors seem to be maintaining positions perfectly incompatible. However, we must maintain the institutions of the country.

#### PARLIAMENT OF THE WEEK.

The House of Commons met at twelve o'clock on Saturday to receive the report of the Committee of Supply. There was not much interest in the sitting. Sir BENJAMIN HALL called attention again to the fact, that the Dean and Chapter of Windsor had received a large fee, stated to be £1000, for the interment of the Queen Dowager. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said the fee was only £220; and Sir Benjamin Hall then read over a list of the names of the Dean and Chapter, and the sums of money received by them. "He had no fear," he said, "for our Church, with reference to her faith; but her discipline, her peculations, and gross mismanagements, called for reform." The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER defended the Dean and Chapter on the ground that these fees were usual, and in the case of this particular fee comparatively small. Mr. GLADSTONE defended the Dean and Chapter, and then made a speech about the sad state of the Colonial Church, complaining of the uncertainty of ecclesiastical law, the want of a defined position of the system of "perfect religious equality" which prevailed, and of the powerlessness of the Bishops in all our Australian colonies. Sir DE LACY EVANS thought it was

quite time the "nonsense" of disseminating bishops throughout the world, and calling them "Lords," should be put an end to. The discussion had no practical issue.

On the first resolution relating to the Admiralty being proposed, a personal altercation ensued between Sir DE LACY EVANS and Admiral DUNDAS, a propos of the important question, Had Sir George Westphal applied, or not, to the Admiralty for active employment? Admiral DUNDAS said Sir George had not, and Sir DE LACY EVANS said he had. The Admiral sharply intimated that such point blank contradiction would not be allowed "out of doors." "Eh? What?" exclaimed the late commander of the Spanish legion, "well I'm quite prepared!" Here the Speaker interposed. Sir DE LACY EVANS was not at all inclined to retract. Twice the bland gentleman in the chair positively asserted that he was "sure his gallant friend" would retract the offensive speech, and at the third iteration Sir DE LACY EVANS was "quite ready to obey the order" of the Speaker; whereupon the offensive word being withdrawn, in a Pickwickian sense, the Admiral declared that "of course" he was in a state of perfect satisfaction. The House cheered, and—the "subject dropped."

At the proper time, Mr. WILLIAMS moved that the vote for "civil contingencies" should be reduced by £220, the "fee" paid to the Dean and Chapter of Windsor. The motion was lost by 37 to 29. The report was finally received.

The only other matter of interest was the Mercantile Marine Amendment Act which was advanced a stage, and the House adjourned at five o'clock.

The scene in the House of Commons on Monday was a continuation of that on Friday. [Related in our Postscript of Saturday last.] Before the order of the day was read, the SPEAKER said that Mr. SALOMONS had complained, by letter, that all notice of his demand to subscribe the oath of abjuration and declare to his property qualification had been omitted from the minutes of the House, and had requested that they should be amended. The Speaker explained that the omission was intentional, as the proceedings alluded to were not before the House, the honourable member having previously declined to take the oath in the form prescribed.

Sir BENJAMIN HALL renewed the question, whether Ministers would prosecute Mr. Salomons for what he had done? Lord JOHN RUSSELL was not at present disposed to think that they ought to prosecute the honourable member for Greenwich. In consequence of this reply, Sir BENJAMIN HALL thought, that Mr. Salomons should come within the House and take his seat; which he did amidst vehement cries of "Order," and "Chair;" he took his seat upon the front bench, below the Ministerial gangway, between Sir Benjamin Hall and Mr. Anstey. The SPEAKER then requested him to withdraw. Loud and fierce rose the shouts of "Withdraw" from the Opposition. Lord John Russell rose to speak, but Mr. Osborne rushed up and placed a motion in the hands of the Speaker, who said the question before the House was on a point of order (namely, the withdrawal of Mr. Salomons), and that it must have precedence. Lord John Russell again rose to speak; but as Mr. Salomons did not withdraw the Speaker interposed, claiming the support of the House, in order to compel the departure of the unwelcome visitor. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, obeying the call of the Speaker, moved, "That Mr. Alderman Salomons be ordered to withdraw;" whereupon, Mr. OSBORNE moved as an amendment the motion he had already placed in the hands of the Speaker. Mr. ANSTAY seconded the amendment—

"The SPEAKER: The motion is, 'That Mr. Alderman Salomons do now withdraw,' on which an amendment has been moved 'to leave out all the words after that,' for the purpose of adding these words 'David Salomons, Esq., having been returned to serve in the present Parliament for the borough of Greenwich, and having taken the oaths prescribed by law in the manner which is binding on his conscience, is entitled to take his seat in this House.' The question I have to put is, that the words proposed to be left out, stand part of the question."

The cry of "Divide" became general, when Mr. ANSTAY rose, and being very much interrupted by "cries," told the interruptors they should not gain their point, for he would move the adjournment. This motion was rejected by 257 to 65. Mr. Alderman Salomons had retained his place, and given his vote on this division.

The House then took the resolution of Lord John Russell into consideration. Mr. ANSTAY made a long speech, concluding that Mr. Salomons had a right to sit and vote. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL and the SOLICITOR-GENERAL decided against him. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, reserving the real question, thought that first of all it was necessary to cause the honourable member to withdraw, in obedience to the request of the Speaker. Mr. BETHELL roundly asserted, that, "both by the principles of the common law, and by the language of the statute law, the oath had been well and legally taken." This view was directly contradicted by Sir FREDERICK THESIGER and Mr. CROWDER. Just before the House divided on Mr. Osborne's amendment Mr. J. A. SMITH intimated that Mr. Salomons would not vote on the present division,

because it was a personal question; but that he did not abandon one tithe of those rights he had come there to claim. The House then divided—

For Mr. Osborne's amendment, 81; against it, 229.  
Majority against, 148.

The House now desired to divide upon the original motion, but Mr. ANSTAY rose, and while he was speaking Mr. Salomons entered the House amid shouts of "Withdraw." Mr. ANSTAY continued and moved the adjournment of the debate. Lord JOHN RUSSELL could not consent to adjourn the debate until the member for Greenwich obeyed the Speaker. An appeal was made to Mr. Alderman Salomons to state the course he should take.

Mr. Alderman SALOMONS, who was sitting in the House, upon the front bench on the Ministerial side, below the gangway, immediately rose; he was at first received with cries of "Withdraw!" from the Opposition benches, but the cries were drowned in the loud cheers with which he was supported. He spoke, firmly and deliberately, as follows:—

"I should not have presumed to address you, Sir, and this House, in the peculiar position in which I am placed, had it not been that I have been so forcibly appealed to by the honourable gentleman who has just sat down. (Hear, hear.) I hope some allowance will be made for the novelty of my position, and for the responsibility that I feel in the unusual course which I have judged it right to adopt—(Hear, hear)—but I beg to assure you, Sir, and this House, that it is far from my desire to do anything that may appear contumacious or presumptuous. (Hear, hear.) Returned, as I have been, by a large constituency, and under no disability, and believing that I have fulfilled all the requirements of the law, I thought I should not be doing justice to my own position as an Englishman or a gentleman, did I not adopt that course which I believed to be right and proper, and appear on this floor—(Hear, hear)—not meaning any disrespect to you, Sir, or to this House—(Hear, hear)—but in defence of my own rights and privileges, and of the rights and privileges of the constituents who have sent me here. (Hear.) Having said this, I beg to state to you, Sir, that whatever be the decision of this House, I shall abide by it, provided there be just sufficient force used to make me feel that I am acting under coercion. I shall not now further intrude myself upon the House, except to say that I trust and hope that, in the doubtful state of the law, such as it has been described to be by the eminent lawyers who addressed you, no severe measures will be adopted towards me and my constituents, without giving me the fairest opportunity of addressing the House, and stating before the House and before the country what I believe to be my rights and the rights of my constituents. (Hear, hear.) I believe the House never will refuse what no Court ever refuses to the meanest subject in the realm, but will hear me before its final decision is pronounced. (Much cheering.)"

The motion for adjournment was still pressed, and on a division negatived by 237 to 75.

The House divided on the main question, that Mr. Salomons be ordered to withdraw. The numbers were—

For the motion, 231; against it, 81.  
Majority, 150.

The SPEAKER informed Mr. Salomons of the decision of the House, and stated that Mr. Salomons, under the circumstances, would see the necessity for his withdrawing.

Mr. Salomons not having withdrawn, the SPEAKER directed the Sergeant-at-arms to remove him. The Sergeant advanced to Mr. Salomons and tapped him on the shoulder, when Mr. Salomons stood up, and having said that he yielded, was interrupted by loud cries of "Order." He retired beyond the bar with the Sergeant.

The House having accomplished a temporary eviction of Mr. Alderman Salomons, Lord JOHN RUSSELL moved a resolution similar to that moved last year, in the case of Baron de Rothschild, with a view of finally excluding Mr. Salomons from the House, until he should take the oath of abjuration in the form appointed by law. He contented himself with making a very short speech, the gist of which was, that they could not admit Mr. Salomons, without an infraction of the law, unless he took the oath "on the true faith of a Christian." There was no general law, as in the case of the Quakers, which permitted the oath to be taken omitting those words. The president of the admission of Mr. Pease, did not apply in the present case. Mr. ANSTAY contended that the words, "on the true faith of a Christian," were not an essential part of the oath; and he moved, with a view of settling the question, an amendment to the effect that the Attorney-General should be ordered to institute proceedings at law against Mr. Salomons, to recover the penalties which it was alleged he had incurred. This amendment was seconded, and afterwards withdrawn, to make way for the following amendment, proposed by Mr. BETHELL:—

"That Baron de Rothschild and Mr. Alderman Salomons having taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and also the oath of abjuration, in the manner in which this House is bound by law to administer the said oaths (hear, hear), are entitled to take their seats as members of this House."

The House now assumed almost the characteristics of a court of justice—lawyer after lawyer rose and



argued the question with the coolness, gravity, and solemnity of a judicial investigation. On one side appeared Mr. Bethell, Mr. Evans, Mr. Aglionby, arguing the right of the Jews to take the oath without the concluding words. Those words, it was urged, were not intended to exclude the Jews, but the Jesuits. The 10th of George I. enacted that the oath might be administered to Jews, in courts of justice, without the aforesaid words. The oath of abjuration was a creation of the Legislature, and not known to the common law:—

"Instead of the noble lord being warranted in concluding that an enactment was necessary and expired (said Mr. Bethell), he would have found here, if he had interpreted the words in a liberal spirit (in which all remedial acts should be interpreted), a declaration of an universal principle, a principle known to the common law, and by this enactment recognized and universally introduced; so that this statute was to be accepted as a legislative recognition of the right of the Jews to have the principle that was adopted in courts of justice carried into other places, and the House was bound by this legislative declaration, as well as by general principles, to administer the oath to the Jew in the manner referred to. (Hear.) The same principle was recognized in the 13th and 20th George II."

With respect to the case of Mr. Pease, the House took upon itself to alter, and modify, and mould the form of the oath, having no authority to do so except the general authority so to apply the formula, that the oath might be administered in the manner binding upon the conscience of the party required to take it, and who had a right to have it administered. (Hear, hear.) In fact the House was in a false position, brought about by following the law, and then stopping short and refusing to follow it out.

On the other side, it was contended by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL and Mr. NAPIER, on the part of the lawyers, that the Legislature intended the whole of the oath to be taken; and this it was which distinguished the case from those where, according to the common law, the form of the oath might be moulded to make it binding upon the conscience as long as the party took the substance of the oath. The 1st and 2nd of Victoria did not allow an oath prescribed by statute in a particular form to be altered at pleasure, said the Attorney-General:—

"It only provided that if a man took an oath, demanding to take it in a particular form, he should be bound by it, and liable to the penalties in case of perjury. For some men, to evade the sanction of an oath, would say a certain form was binding by their religion when it was not. (Hear.)"

As for the Quakers, it was urged that there was a whole series of statutes relating to them; and though an act was passed removing all doubt respecting their right to make an affirmation, the committee on Mr. Pease's case thought that act unnecessary, and so did the Attorney-General.

The lay speakers were Mr. Henry Drummond and Sir Robert Inglis. Mr. DRUMMOND said he had always objected to the Jews sitting in that House; but he would not take advantage of a state of the law which never was intended to affect them, to carry into effect a principle which he could not do fairly otherwise. (Hear.)

"He wished some one would fairly propose a motion to exclude Jews from Parliament. For that he would vote; but he did not like to be compelled to be firing in ambush against the Jews from behind a dike that was intended to exclude a Sardinian Prince. (Hear, hear.)"

When the House divided there were—

For Mr. Bethell's amendment, 71; against it, 118.

Majority against the amendment, 47.

The debate now took a different turn, the lay members of the House intervened, and the gravity of the discussion vanished. When the original motion was put, Mr. BRIGHT rose and suggested that Mr. Salomons ought to be heard, either by himself or by counsel at the bar, in support of his right to take his seat. He thought also that there ought to be a committee appointed to reconsider the subject. He requested Lord John Russell to postpone his motion, and for that purpose he moved the adjournment of the debate. Mr. ANSTY seconded the motion. Lord JOHN RUSSELL would not consent to an adjournment: he thought the only way in which Mr. Salomons could be heard would be by himself at the bar of the House. Sir BENJAMIN HALL thought that that course would lower and injure the position at present occupied by Mr. Salomons. The motion for adjournment was rejected on a division by 190 to 69.

Mr. G. THOMPSON moved, by way of amendment, the following addition to the motion of the noble lord at the head of the Government:—

"And that this House, having regard to the religious scruples of the honourable member for Greenwich, will exercise its undoubted privilege in that behalf, and proceed forthwith to cause such alterations to be made in the form and mode of administering the said oath as will enable the honourable member to take and subscribe the same."

Another attempt was made to adjourn the debate. Mr. REYNOLDS made a playful speech, in the course of which he said:—

"He regretted that so much of the time of the House had been taken up in discussing religious questions.

(Oh, oh.) He thought the House would soon be entitled to the designation of a second edition of Exeter-hall; it would, if it went on in the same course, become a religious conventicle. ('Oh' and a laugh.)"

Mr. REYNOLDS spoke as a Catholic, and he sympathized with the Jews, though Mr. Salomons had said bitter things about the Papal aggression. He then made a lively onslaught on the oaths of abjuration, which he said were as great an absurdity as could be imagined:—

"It required men to swear that they would bear no allegiance to King James III., or any of his descendants, when the fact was that they had all been dead more than fifty years! The person who took this oath further swore that he would bear true allegiance to her Majesty and to the descendants of the Princess Sophia of Hanover. He (Mr. Reynolds) was ready to observe that oath, and to bear true allegiance to her Majesty; but how was he to trace all the descendants of the Princess Sophia? (Laughter.) Yet this was what was termed one of the bulwarks of the British constitution! ('Hear, hear' and laughter.)"

The discussion now became personal. Mr. BRIGHT asked whether the House would "presume," under the circumstances, to go to a decision. They should be decent, at least, in their judgments, and not shut out argument or fact. Lord JOHN RUSSELL got quite cross, and selected Mr. George Thompson as a victim:—

"Then there had been declamation against his conduct on the part of the honourable member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Thompson), who, forsooth, when he (Lord J. Russell) was endeavouring to persuade the House to agree to a law which should admit the Jews into Parliament, was lecturing or travelling in America—(loud cries of 'Hear, hear')—and totally neglecting the interests of a numerous body of constituents of the Hebrew persuasion—(renewed cries of 'Hear, hear')—and now came forward, as the House had heard, having refrained from giving his vote when that vote might have had great influence, and might have contributed to change the result."

He continued to defend himself very fiercely; and ultimately promised to bring in a bill which he thought, if supported by a considerable majority, would be passed by the House of Lords. The House again divided on the question of adjournment, which was negatived by 207 to 59. It was now very late, and Lord John Russell, thinking it was advisable that the discussion carried on should not be of an angry nature, at length consented to adjourn the debate till Friday.

The House on Wednesday granted a new writ for Limerick, in the room of John O'Connell; advanced several bills a stage; but transacted no business of political importance; the chief matter debated being the Administration of Criminal Justice Improvement Bill, which was advanced in committee, the chairman reporting progress, and obtaining leave to sit again.

The House held the morning sitting on Thursday in the new chamber, which, it is reported, is acoustically improved, but architecturally disfigured. In the evening they met in the old chamber. One of the first things decided on was, that the petition from the borough of Greenwich to be heard at the bar, should be presented on Monday, and that the adjourned debate should then be resumed.

On the order for the third reading of the Customs Bill, Mr. HERRIES moved as an amendment, an address, praying her Majesty to direct steps to be taken for giving effect to those provisions of the act for the repeal of the Navigation Laws, whereby her Majesty is empowered to adopt towards any foreign country in which a preference is given to national vessels over British vessels, measures to counteract such disadvantages to British trade and navigation. The ground of the complaint was, that foreign nations had not reciprocated the repeal of the navigation laws; but instead of imitating our example they were profiting by our folly. The object of the motion was said to be, not the subversion, but the enforcement of the present system. Mr. LABOUCHERE and Mr. WILSON opposed the motion on the grounds, that the general extension of the commerce of this country; that British shipping had derived its full share of benefit from this extension; and that the British shipbuilder had not been injured by the change. Mr. HERRIES was supported by Mr. GEORGE FREDERICK YOUNG, who denied that under Free-trade the shipping interest had participated in the general prosperity. The debate went on very languidly, and was killed when Mr. DISRAELI recommended simultaneously the withdrawal of the motion, and the adjournment of the debate. The Customs Bill was, of course, read a third time, after two ineffective divisions on the adjournment.

While the conflict between Mr. Alderman Salomons and the formalists of the House of Commons was raging on Monday night, the Lords were debating the Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill. The conduct of the measure is entrusted to the Marquis of Lansdowne, who moved the second reading in a speech which testifies his reluctance to follow in the course into which the Russell Durham Letter hurried Ministers. Of course he called the proceedings under the rescript an "aggression;" and he told the House to "reject the bill," if they held

that it would interfere with the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion in Great Britain and Ireland, or if it was a persecuting measure. He maintained that "titles" were not mere forms, but things of substance, to which importance had always been very properly attached. And he quoted a "homely" remark of Queen Elizabeth with respect to the title of a peer then in the House, which had been conferred by a foreign power. Elizabeth said he should not have the title—"She never had allowed, nor ever would allow, her sheep to be tarred by another shepherd." He thought that the bill would not in the slightest degree interfere with the full performance of Roman Catholic worship:—

"But he admitted that if he had been asked whether he considered this bill to be essential to the maintenance of the Protestant religion, he must answer that he did not—(hear, hear)—because he was one of those who thought that the Protestant religion did not rest for its support, or that it would be right that it should so rest, on acts of Parliament or on contrivances of any kind. (Hear, hear.)"

The Earl of ABERDEEN was the champion of the opposition. He made a careful speech, replying to the often-urged arguments of the supporters of the measure, and earnestly appealed to the House to prevent a recurrence of the persecution and the contest which preceded the victory of Catholic emancipation. That act relieved the Catholics from civil disabilities of a galling nature; and though the present measure might not be felt in a material sense, he thought it would be found a "grievance intolerable" in its operation upon the conscience. The bill dealt with matters "purely spiritual;" and he pointed out the great distinction between the bishops of the Church of England, who were temporal lords as well as spiritual rulers, and the bishops of the Catholic Church, who in England were only and purely governors of the Church. He denied that a Church was tolerated even, to which regular government was refused. He denied that any rights of our bishops were infringed by the rescript, the only reason on which to base a retaliatory act. He asked for the Roman Catholics only that amount of freedom conceded to every dissenting sect. He wished to place Roman Catholics and Dissenters upon the same footing. They were so regarded by law, and so regarded they ought to be.

He commented with severity on the changes which the measure had undergone; and he contended that not only was the state of things with regard to the assumption of titles restored, which existed prior to 1829, but made additionally stringent. He also cited the 24th section of the Relief Act, and appealed to the House to say whether the assumption of titles not already appropriated was forbidden. He pointed out that while the assumption of appropriated titles was prohibited in England and Ireland, no mention was made of Scotland. Why was there no mention of Scotland? Because in Scotland there were no bishops, no deans, no persons in possession of those titles who were recognized by law. Hence he inferred that the bill before them was a violation of the act of 1829. He characterized the rescript as an "insolent manifesto," but if the intention of the bill was to answer that, why was that intention not avowed? Recurring again to the titles, he said the Pope must describe his bishops somehow. He had a perfect right to change the irregular and exceptional government of vicars apostolic to the regular government of bishops in ordinary. There was nothing real in the new hierarchy. As far as their lordships were concerned, the hierarchy had no existence "except in words." He traced back the origin of the desire to appoint bishops to the days of Pitt. He declared that the "most frightful" and "awful" consequences would ensue from the operation of the first clause, which made the appointments, and, therefore, the acts of the bishops illegal and void. He ridiculed the notion that the supremacy of the Crown had been violated, a supremacy which had never been defined. The Queen's supremacy was rejected in Scotland. There was no such thing. As to Ireland, he thought the Government were quite right; if the bill were passed at all, it must include Ireland, for to admit that the Queen stood in a different relation in England from that which she did in Ireland, would be to decide the destruction of the Irish Church. He moved that the bill be read a second time that day three months.

Lord BRAMFORD replied to the Earl of Aberdeen. He explained his position in the debate. He said he appeared isolated from those who shared his religious convictions in the course he took. But he knew that many sympathized with him, and, as they had not dared to come forward, he had taken upon himself the responsibility of standing alone. He described the position of the Roman Catholics in England, before the introduction of the Papal rescript, as being one every way favourable to them, and in some respects enjoying advantages which they could not enjoy in any other country. Was this position changed by the rescript? Were they in a better position? He contended that the position of the Roman Catholics had not changed, but that of the Roman see in relation to the English Crown had changed. The act of appointing a bishop, and assigning to him

jurisdiction over a district, was a temporal act which could in no country, not even in Naples, be performed without the consent of the Crown. He described the alternative to which the Catholics were reduced:—

"It placed them in this dilemma, that they must either bow down humbly at the feet of the Pope, or break with Rome altogether. If they looked at the Pope's act with the eye of the Constitution, they must break with the Pope; if they looked at it with the eye of the Pope, they must break the law."

The Earl of ABERDEEN had ridiculed the idea of a Continental conspiracy against liberty. Lord BEAUMONT replied:—

"It was his (Lord Beaumont's) opinion that there was at present unfortunately an ultra-montane party predominant, not so much on the other side of the Alps as on this, and the object of the recent act of the Pope was to give to the Roman Catholics of this country an ultra-montane character. The step taken was but the first of a series on the part of the Court of Rome, directed against the liberal Catholicism which had grown up in this country. It was intended to bring over to the views of the fanatical converts, whose extravagance and absurd prejudices had brought disgrace on their adopted religion, those honest, liberal, straightforward Catholics who were satisfied with their position, and endeavoured to conform to the spirit of the free and liberal institutions of their country. (Hear.)"

The bill was supported by the Duke of WELLINGTON, the Earl of MALMESBURY, and the Duke of ARGYLL. Lord BERNERS opposed it. The general drift of the speeches was, in a quieter fashion, much the same as that in the other House. On the motion of the Earl of WINCHELSEA, the debate was adjourned.

The subject was resumed on Tuesday, and the debate carried on with great vigour.

The Earl of WINCHELSEA said a great many extravagant things, with the rough force of expression which characterizes the speeches of that ancient foe of Catholicism, in support of the bill. But the interest of the debate was concentrated upon Lord LYNCHBURGH, who delivered a clear and masterly statement of the contents of the measure. He also, like the Marquis of Lansdowne, had to set himself right with the House, and show that his present, was not inconsistent with his past, conduct. He had been a party to the Relief Act of 1829. He was satisfied that that was a measure of justice, and absolutely necessary in the then state of Ireland. Afterwards he again came into power (1841). A commission was sitting at that time to inquire into the criminal law, and he directed it to inquire into those acts which, at various times, had been passed for the repression and persecution of Catholicism. They made their report, a measure was introduced and carried (in 1846), expunging from the statute-book the greater part of those acts, and in others the extreme penalty imposed by them:—

"The object that he and his colleagues who co-operated with him had in view, was the extension of toleration to the Roman Catholics. Did he say toleration? He meant a full participation of all the rights and privileges of the rest of her Majesty's subjects. That was the object he had in view, and he thought they had fully attained that object. But toleration would never satisfy the Roman Catholic Church. (Hear, hear.) Toleration they wished for, to save themselves from inconvenience, and further, as a stepping-stone to the attainment of power; but toleration as a principle was wholly alien to the Roman Catholic Church. (Hear.) It was acknowledged that they despised it. Had he good authority for that? He had strong and decisive authority. In a letter from the late Pope to the bishops of Belgium he said, 'They talk of establishing liberty of conscience. It is an absurd and erroneous maxim—it is a wild notion. I reject it with disdain.' (Hear.) What was it they desired? Domination and ascendancy; and never would they be satisfied until they obtained the object of their ambition. (Hear.) Had their designs changed from what they were in former times? What they were 300 years ago, they were at the present moment—hesitating when politic, blinking when necessary, advancing when it could be done with safety. They told us that their principles were eternal—immutable. (Hear, hear.) He was willing and anxious that toleration and liberty of conscience should be granted to the fullest extent. But toleration was widely different from domination. There, then, he took his stand—(hear, hear); and because he conceived that this was the first step towards establishing that principle, he voted in support of this bill. (Hear, hear.)"

He charged it against the Irish Roman Catholics, that, after having accepted the Relief Act, they had broken faith, and violated its provisions in many instances. Finally, they had called together a Synod and condemned the Colleges, and the Pope had ratified the condemnation. He would resist, as far as he could, every encroachment; he would rescind nothing of what had been done. He approved of it. If it came over again, he should follow the same course. But there he took his stand. Not one step toward the attainment of power, or the attainment of ascendancy of domination, would he proceed. Such was his explanation of his personal relation to the bill.

The main point of his speech, however, consisted of a detailed exposition of the provisions of the bill and

their operation. He divided it into two distinct parts—the one declaratory of the existing law, the other enacting the new law. The law declared was that the attempt of the Pope to establish sees was illegal, and it followed that the jurisdiction alleged to be created by that act of the Pope, was illegal also. He produced many instances from the history of foreign nations, past and contemporary, to show that the Pope never had been allowed to appoint to a see without the consent of the Crown—even in Roman Catholic countries.

The enacting portion of the bill was to this effect:—Any person assuming the title of any see would be subject to a penalty. Also the bill provided that the penalty might be enforced by any one, with the consent of the Attorney-General. This was preferable to the present law. For thirty years the present law had not been enforced. Better repeal the penalty than leave it so. An Attorney-General might sleep at his post; this bill recalled him to activity. On these grounds he supported the bill.

Among the other speakers who advocated and defended the measure was Lord CLANRICARDE, who looked upon the bill as necessary to defend the country from Papal encroachments. He said:—

"It was impossible to overlook what was going on in Europe. Everywhere the Pope was seeking to increase his influence; witness the treaty recently concluded between Spain and the Court of Rome. The recent act of the Pope was in conformity with the old policy of Rome, which sought to attain its ends by fomenting discord in states which refused to submit to its dominion."

The LORD CHANCELLOR took the Government view of the matter entirely—quietly acquiescing in the Thesiger amendments as unavoidable evils. He made a very unmethodical speech, containing many points treated of without order, but said positively nothing which had not been said on the same side in the other House. Lord HARDWICK supported the bill "with reluctance," and affirmed that "no party did support it thoroughly."

The opposition, though few in number, was very spirited. The Duke of NEWCASTLE ran the whole round of the arguments which tended to damage the bill. He censured the manner, while he acknowledged the substantial propriety of the rescript, contending that bishops must have a territorial designation, and that it was better to have bishops in ordinary than vicars apostolic. Lord MONTAGUE attacked the measure with great spirit, criticising the conduct of Ministers, in reference to their former conduct as Ministers, when they had distinctly refused to prosecute Irish bishops for the assumption of titles as illegal then as now. He treated the measure with especial reference to Ireland, and showed that the Irish bishops had been constantly recognized by the courts as territorial bishops. Why, then, suddenly turn upon them now and prosecute? The people of Ireland would not permit them to forget their responsibility.

"He implored their lordships not to pass this bill, which would give rise to an agitation that would be most injurious, because it would be founded on a basis of truth and justice. (Cheers.)"

The Earl of ST. GERMAIN'S energetically opposed the bill. His peroration is remarkable.

"I think," continued the noble earl, "I know something of Ireland. I am sure I take a great interest in all that relates to the people of that country, and I can unfeignedly declare that I never felt so strongly and deeply on any political question affecting them, as I do upon this. I cannot contemplate the adoption of this bill without dismay. You may put down rebellion with the sword, but, my lords, how will you contend with—"

"Th' unconquerable will,  
"And study of revenge, immortal hate,  
"And courage never to submit or yield?"

These are among the consequences which you have to apprehend, and I earnestly hope your lordships will not adopt a measure which will again rivet on the Roman Catholics those fetters which the continued efforts of the greatest statesmen this country ever produced, have but lately succeeded in striking off. (Cheers.)"

Lord LANSDOWNE replied, commenting in general terms on the principal points of the debate; the House divided, and the numbers were—

Contents for second reading, present 146, proxies 119—265; non-contents, for amendment, present 26, proxies 12—38. Majority in favour of second reading, 227.

Their lordships adjourned at five minutes to four o'clock.

ERNEST JONES.—Lord DUDLEY STUART brought the case of Ernest Charles Jones before the House on Tuesday. He gave a very fair account of the indignities and persecutions inflicted on Mr. Jones by the Governor of Tothill-fields prison, and he moved "for copies of all rules and regulations which at any time, from the year 1840 to the present time, had been in force within the several prisons in England and Wales, so far as they affected prisoners convicted of political offences." The motion was supported by Mr. W. Williams, Mr. W. J. Fox, Sir H. Willoughby, Sir De Lacy Evans, Mr. George Thompson, and Colonel Thompson; that is to say, these gentlemen all agreed that Mr. Jones had been very cruelly treated. Mr. Henley qualified his opinion. He said it would be difficult to say that Mr. Jones had not been harshly dealt with. As there is no distinction

between political and other offenders, the papers could not be produced, and the motion was withdrawn, upon the distinct understanding that the noble lord should obtain, as an unopposed return, the rules and regulations of certain prisons which he would designate, in which political offenders had been imprisoned.

#### THE FRIENDS OF ITALY.

A society has just been formed in London under the name of the Society of the Friends of Italy, having in view the following objects:—

"1. By public meetings, lectures, and the press, and especially by affording opportunities to the most competent authorities for the publication of works on the history of the Italian National Movement—to promote a correct appreciation of the Italian question in this country."

"2. To use every available constitutional means of furthering the cause of Italian National Independence in Parliament."

"3. And generally to aid, in this country, the cause of the independence, and of the political and religious liberty of the Italian People."

The names of the council are a guarantee that the Society is in its endeavours, to serve the cause of Italy. Amongst them we find the names of W. H. Ashurst, of Muswell-hill; William Coningham, Brighton; G. Crawshaw, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; George Dawson, M.A., Birmingham; T. S. Duncombe, M.P., Finsbury; G. J. Holyoake, London; Thornton Hunt, Hammersmith; Douglas Jerrold, London; Walter Savage Landor, Bath; Reverend E. R. Larken, Lincoln; T. Latimer, Exeter; G. H. Lewis, Kensington; Dr. M. Knight, Belfast; W. C. Macready, Sherbourne; Edward Miall, London; F. Mowatt, M.P., Pentyn; Professor Newman, London; E. F. S. Pigott, London; W. Scholefield, M.P., Birmingham; T. J. Serle, Hammersmith; James Stansfield, junior, Brompton; and Lord Dudley Stuart, M.P., Marylebone. Mr. David Masson has been appointed secretary of this society.

The first public act of the society has been to present the following petition to the House of Commons, through Mr. Thomas Duncombe:—

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled,  
The Humble Petition of the Undersigned, Members of the Council of the Society of the Friends of Italy, for and on behalf of the Council of the said Society,

Showeth,—That during these two years, after having, without provocation, attacked and overthrown the Roman Republic, a Republic legally and peacefully organized by the will of the Roman People through Universal Suffrage, and confirmed by a gallant and glorious defence, French troops have been sojourning in Rome as in a conquered territory.

That, as a palliative, or an attenuation of this shameful deed of violent interference in the affairs of a free, peaceful, and friendly People, they uniformly declared in all their proclamations, acts, and assemblies, that they were doing for the purpose of establishing peace and order, and consulting the real wishes of the Roman population—whom they wrongly asserted to be enslaved and misled by a violent faction—as to the political institutions, and guarantees for civil freedom, which should be set up in Rome.

That the English Government, while indirectly, and as your petitioners believe, unjustly participating in the deed (since its real sympathy with the re-instatement of the Pope distinctly appears in the correspondence on the affairs of Rome recently presented to your Honourable House, and especially in the extract No. 12, from the letter of the Marquis of Normanby), still maintained that such re-instatement ought not to be disjoined from ancient securities to the Roman people for the enjoyment of constitutional liberties.

That the same Government deprecated, at the time, any prolonged sojourn of the French troops in Rome.

That the ostensible aim of the French troops on entering Rome has not been attained, not a semblance of constitutional liberty having been since established, nor the will of the Roman People in any manner consulted; but that despotism alone, and unlimited authority, and the whole series of the old and often condemned abuses, have been re-introduced, and are still kept up by force, in the midst of a people who wishes for a free Government, and for the separation of the spiritual from the temporal authority of the Pope, have been amply and unmistakably declared.

That, after two years of fruitless and unjust occupation, the French troops still seem bent upon perpetuating their sojourn in Rome to an indefinite period, and that they are increasing the number of their men there, and fortifying various places of importance within the city.

That, being now equally obnoxious to the People and to the Pope, they lead by their obstinacy to the idea that a permanent military conquest is intended.

That such a military conquest could not be tolerated without a flagrant violation of every international law, as well as of the high principles of Justice and Liberty—the admission of which violation would inflict irreparable disgrace on the character of the English nation.

That the prolonged sojourn of which the petitioners complain, is engendering mutual reaction and hatred between the occupiers and occupied, leading to instances of revenge, and producing anarchy and other deplorable results.

That the Roman States have been simultaneously invaded by Austrian troops, which are still there, and for the withdrawal of which there is no chance, so long as the French troops keep their position in the same states.

That Nationality is a sacred thing, which cannot be violated without the establishment thereby of a precedent dangerous to every free nation, without exception.



That the principle of non-interference, solemnly proclaimed by England in 1831, cannot be understood in any worthy or consistent sense, unless applied with equal stringency to all nations, and so made a guarantee for the free development by each, within itself, of its native tendencies and liberties.

That it is a crime, and a shame, for any people, itself enjoying the blessings of freedom, to allow glaring injustice to be done to another people, without trying to put an end to the same, or at least protesting, in the most solemn manner possible, its detestation of the wrong done.

That it is, besides, in the highest degree impolitic to persist in this plan of national indifference in the case of a People deserving so nobly of mankind as the Italians do, both from their illustrious services in the past, and by reason of their large capacities for the future—the more especially when the governing power, enabled by foreign arms to crush and oppress this celebrated People, is a power founded on political falsehood and unbounded intellectual and moral tyranny, and one which is even now endeavouring to spread and enshrine such falsehood and such tyranny amongst ourselves.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray your Honourable House to present an address to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will use her good offices to put an end to the present occupation of Rome on the part of the French Republic.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

In addition to this the society have issued an address, written with great power, earnestness, and eloquence. We quote its two concluding paragraphs, which show the objects of the society:—

"The Society of the Friends of Italy has been formed to assist in carrying out these views. To promote a correct knowledge of the Italian question, to stimulate the expression of just public opinion on the Italian question, and to urge the Parliament and the Government of the country to an appropriate course of national action in the Italian question—such are the aims of this society. It purposes nothing but what is strictly British. It proposes to act upon Italy by stirring up England to act upon Italy. It assumes no right of direct operations upon the land in which it takes an interest. Its funds are not to be expended in subsidies for war, or in any other way contrary to the spirit and habits of Englishmen. It is to pronounce nothing, to dictate nothing, as to the form or forms of national government which it might be desirable to set up in Italy. This question of the future internal organization of Italy, it regards as belonging exclusively to the Italian people. It is strictly a society of Englishmen, working, within the English territory, and according to English methods, for the freedom and independence of the Italian nation.

"We appeal, then, to the British public in behalf of this society. We appeal to all classes. We appeal to working-men; we appeal to the wealthy; we appeal to men in stations of official influence; we appeal to journalists and men of letters. We appeal to clergymen, we appeal to laymen; we appeal to Churchmen, we appeal to Dissenters. Confident as we are that the question of Italy is one which may call forth a more general, a more truly national enthusiasm in Great Britain than any other foreign question that could be named, it is our earnest wish to avoid, in the constitution of our society, all that is sectarian or exclusive. We invite all who can co-operate with us at once to do so; we invite all who think they can co-operate with us to try to do so. Nor do we ask too much. We do not ask that you, as Englishmen, should devote your days and nights to the Italian question—that you should neglect other interests for this. We only ask that, as far as and as strongly as you do feel for Italy when the matter is brought before you, so far and so strongly you will take a part in her behalf; we only ask that you would give to this cause and question an amount of study and of active interest proportionate to its just and great claims."

#### THE CLERGYMAN AT THE CRYSTAL PALACE.

Burton-by-Lincoln, July 21, 1851.

MY DEAR —,—Your absence from England puts your personal inspection of our Great Exhibition entirely out of the question, and you may naturally wish for some account of the impressions made by it upon one with whom you held, of yore, much in common, and with whom, when differing, you were wont to carry on the interchange of friendly controversy. Accept, then, this attempt to describe the feelings with which your friend regarded the "World's Fair," feelings which he believes you would, had you been present, have for the most part shared with him.

In common with the crowd of visitors, I was of course impressed with the sense of vastness and gorgeous beauty which the first entrance into the Palace of Wonders invariably creates in those who view it at an early hour, on an uncrowded day. I cannot conceive it possible for one under such circumstances not to realize the extreme of sensuous enjoyment! The bright sunshine, the chaste and tempered colouring, the waving banners, the splendid tapestry, the lovely flowers, the breathing forms of art, the rustling leaves, the pleasant sounds of music blended with the tinkling of the fountains, the exquisite perfumes which load the air, combine to produce in that vast hall an overpowering consciousness of the beautiful; the soothing effect of which it is painful to shake off, when, as is of course necessary, you enter on the examination in detail of this treasure-house of the world. That consciousness was to me a foretaste of the glorious time when, with every one of our noblest faculties for enjoyment

heightened and purified, we shall enter upon undisturbed fruition of the infinite and eternal universe itself, with all that it contains of the Good, the Beautiful, and the True.

But the day advances, and the crowd begins to thicken. I visit with them the different receptacles of art. Borne on that living stream, I look on the means and appliances for luxury which they seem to regard as their own by undisputed right. If these things strike them with astonishment, it is from the vast quantities in which they are brought together, or from the extraordinary beauty of some of the individual articles; for with their uses and their delights, the Rich, who on this day fill the Crystal Palace, seem perfectly familiar. I break away from the tide, and I muse on the destiny of those sparkling thousands: whether it will be ever theirs to wake to the consciousness of the responsibilities which their advantages involve, of the contrast between their condition and that of the toiling millions by whom those articles of luxury, which they claim as their own, are made; and with what feelings they would meet the conditions of equality which may be here, and certainly will be hereafter, imposed upon them. But God's goodness is over all, and He will teach them sooner or later their individual destinies, and those of combined humanity; and when knowledge comes to them, they will learn how to bear themselves in the altered circumstances of their existence.

Or on a day when the myriads of industry visit the receptacle of their own handiwork, I mix with them, and listen to the honest pride with which they regard their own creation. Many an artisan points out to his companion the machine which his own brawny arms have helped to fashion. Many an intelligent workwoman, the fabrics her fingers have intertwined or embroidered. They listen to the sounds and gaze on the sights of beauty. The very rustics by whom the crowd is swelled, brighten into intelligence at the wondrous spectacle before them; and all seem to lose the recollection that to these sources of delight they have no individual access in their daily life, in the general enjoyment of them in their own hall. Watching these almost countless thousands, I question myself as to whether they also will ever have an awakening, whether they will recognize the truth, that with themselves alone does it rest to continue to produce without enjoying, or to produce and enjoy the fruits of their industry as freely and as fully as each individual of that moneyed crowd which yesterday filled the palace and gazed on those articles of luxury as on its own. I ask myself whether they will see that this change in their position may be attained by concert, concert among themselves and with the possessors of capital; and I trust in God's providence again that he will show them this great truth when the time arrives for its being universally acted upon. Many of their brethren admit it, and act upon it already. Many of the Rich are ready to aid them in any well meant effort for their emancipation. May Heaven speed the endeavours both of Rich and Poor, of capitalist and workmen, and let them labour together in the true fraternal spirit of the religion! "which," as our friend Novalis says, "is the root of all Democracy, the highest fact in the rights of man."

As a minister of that religion I have found the spectators the most engrossing portion of the Exhibition; and my questionings have, as you have seen, been chiefly on their present position and future destinies. Of the specimens of religious art I have not much to say. I question, indeed, whether an industrial medley is a fit place to exhibit such works as those with which the Medieval department is thronged. Whether the recumbent effigy of a ruler of the Church is seemly put forth, pattern-wise, with the maker's name on label; whether high altars should be paraded as commonly as sideboards, and church furniture as that of a drawing-room. Whether the Cross, and the Ineffable Agony of Him who died on it, should be exposed to glances as reckless as those that rest on bowie knives and Colt's revolvers, or the calm beauty of the Madonna be made a gazing-stock for the eyes that have just been cast, with whatever emotion, on a Venus or a Bacchante. I much doubt whether reverence is not fostered to a great extent by the display of dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in full canonicals; at all events I felt glad when I heard the remarks of the crowd surrounding them, not on a shilling day, that none of our own bishops stood there as large as life.

The lover of contrasts may find occupation in comparing the gorgeous specimens of missals, breviaries, and other books of Catholic ritual, with the comparatively simple and unadorned copies of the Scriptures furnished by the Bible Society. The genius of a preaching rather than a praying age finds its example in the representation of an acoustic pulpit; and the anxiety to withdraw from our crowded communities the bodies of the dead, to treat them with reverence, and protect the living from their unhealthy influences, is manifested in the gigantic pyramid intended as a place for metropolitan sepulture; while the curious in church architecture may find some excellent models, and some beautiful specimens of

painted glass, both British and foreign, in which the extravagant hideousness of revived mediævalism is replaced by forms of truthful and lifelike beauty.

It is impossible that these things should be passed unnoticed; nor could I leave without regard the cottages intended for emigrants—of which, alas! I fear but few who leave our shores would be rich enough to avail themselves; nor the model lodging-houses for those of England's children who yet remain, as all should have the choice of doing, in their native land.

But the living figures, the spectators, as I have said, engaged me most of all—and from the contemplation of them was I led to think of those who were not there: the millions of whom it might not be said that they would not, but that they could not come. In how many unwholesome alleys and crowded workshops, in how many scenes of misery, starvation, and wretchedness might not the absentees be found! The myriads were there—but where were the millions? How could they be the better for the Exhibition?

And then I remembered again, that God's goodness was over all, and that the Divine principle of concert which would reconcile the rich consumers, and the comparatively rich producers, would give them power to raise in a proportionate degree the poorest, most ignorant, and most degraded class of all.

That this will be the case hereafter I devoutly believe. Our task is to labour for it now, under all discouragements, and trust in God for the issue. And if the Church will, as I trust she will, accept this mission, she may, indeed, in the struggle, have her martyrs to commemorate, even as those of "Canterbury" and of "Paris," but she will, in time, with sweeter melody and greater power than can be found in all the glorious music of the Crystal Palace, be entitled to lead the numberless voices of the universe in the triumphant strain, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, goodwill towards men."

Yours ever affectionately, EDMUND R. LARKEN.

The numbers attending the Exposition this week have fluctuated; been upwards of 70,000 on Monday, and 44,000 on Thursday, chiefly owing to the weather. Mr. Belshaw has succeeded in mounting the state howdah on the Saffron Walden elephant, which has been lent for the purpose.

The Patent Tubular Brick Machine of Messrs. Borie, Brothers, civil engineers, Boulevards Poissonnière, Paris, in connection with E. Elliott, merchant, 33, Buckesbury, has been visited by the Queen and Prince Albert, at the Crystal Palace, to whom information in reference to this invention was communicated.

#### FRENCH POLITICS—DEFEAT OF MINISTERS.

In our last number we brought the proceedings of the Assembly, on the revision question, down to the speech of M. Berryer. That orator made a long, and it is admitted, brilliant oration on the substantial question, though he said little on the technical question—the revision. He defended the fourteen centuries of Monarchy, which M. Michel de Bourges had arraigned. He was for revision, but legal revision. He feared the unconstitutional election of Louis Napoleon, more than the "invasion of their social enemies." But he pointed out with great force the probable hazards of the double election of 1852, when the powers of the Legislative and the Executive expire within a week of each other.

Hitherto a certain calmness had reigned in the Assembly. There had been less interruption than occurs upon unusual occasions in the House of Commons. But now the scene changed. A speaker mounted the tribune, whose language roused the passions of the Right, and threw the Assembly into a hurricane of noise and confusion. Victor Hugo followed M. Berryer, and like the great Legitimist spoke less upon the revision of the Constitution than the evils of the Monarchy and the advantages of the Republic. He stung his opponents by the directness of his charges. He stigmatized the Government as "one vast intrigue." He rapidly summed up the disgrace, the stains, the infamies, which the Government of the President had inflicted on France. "This," he exclaimed, "is our situation. France bows her head, Napoleon quivers in his tomb, and 6000 rascals shout Vive l'Empereur! What, because there was once a man who gained the battle of Marengo, who reigned, is the man to reign who gained the battle of Satory. (Laughter.) Because we had once a Napoleon the Great, must we now have a Napoleon the Little?" At the conclusion of this sentence a frightful uproar arose; M. Léon Faucher declared that the orator insulted the President, and Victor Hugo replied that he did not understand how it was an insult to the President to say he was not great. In his attack upon the majority he eloquently characterized them as men who, when they heard the words liberty, democracy, progress, fell flat upon their faces and listened for the sound of the Russian cannon. Impartial President Dupin called him to order, and there was a terrible row. But the higher the tide of rage swelled around Victor Hugo, the calmer he grew; and he galled his enemies by the severest sarcasms and the keenest

retorts. It was a great speech; the wrath which it provoked only showing the cap fitted, and how securely the majority relied upon its numerical strength.

The remainder of the debate was less stormy. M. Baroche, of course, spoke in favour of revision. But he received a bitter lesson when he ventured to call in question the authority of the Constituent Assembly. It was not, he said, the representative of France. So great was the agitation that the sitting was suspended. When it was resumed he insinuated a retraction. The other speakers were M. Dufaure and Odillon Barrot. Both these statesmen confined themselves with more closeness than the preceding speakers to the technical question—shall there be a revision? Dufaure concluded against, and Barrot in favour of, revision. Then, although Jules Favre demanded to be heard, the majority closed the debate.

The division lasted two hours, and the issue was that there were—

For revision, 446; against it, 278.  
Legal majority against, 90.

The terms of the constitution require a majority of three-fourths of the total number of voters, or 543; consequently the revision is lost.

The principal members who voted against the revision were, in *Tiers parti*—Generals Cavaignac, Lamoricière, Bedeau, and Leflo; Messrs. Dufaure, Corne, Creton, Monet, Valette, St. Beuve, Oscar Lafayette, and Ferdinand de Lusteyrie; in the *Orléans party*—Messrs. Thiers, Baze, General Changarnier, Jules de Laeteyrie, Delessert, Desmousseaux, de Givry, Hernoux, De Mornay, Piscatory, de Remusat, Roger du Nord, Mispoulet; and in the ultra-*Legitimist party*—Messrs. La Rochejacquelein, Leo de Laborde, Raudot, Bouhier de l'Ecluse, Comberel de Leyval, Favreau. Also Messrs. Napoleon Bonaparte, Pierre Bonaparte, De Lamartine, General Fabvier, and M. Dupin himself, voted against the revision.

When the Assembly next met a second defeat awaited the Ministers. M. de Melun presented his report upon the petitions for revision, and in it complained strongly of the conduct of some prefects and subordinate functionaries in getting up petitions. Thereupon M. Baze and Colonel Charras moved an order of the day, censuring Ministers, which was carried by 333 to 320. The same night Ministers resigned, and Louis Napoleon refused to accept their resignation.

The *Monteur du Soir* says:—

"M. Thiers is positively expected at Vienna in the month of August, where he will remain ten or fifteen days. M. Thiers has demanded and obtained from the Assembly leave of absence for a month, commencing on the 25th of July. He is immediately to leave for England; on the 25th of August he is to return to Paris."

It is stated in diplomatic circles in Paris that the Sovereigns of the minor German States purpose visiting Vienna in the course of the present month, and that the visit is connected with politics.

Lord Palmerston, in reply to a question put by Mr. Anstey on Tuesday night, in the House of Commons, stated that her Majesty's Government had, in common with the Government of France, protested against the admission of the non-German provinces of Austria into the Germanic Confederation, and that the Government of her Majesty could not regard that question as one purely German. He added that, as yet, the Government had received no reply to that protest.

In its sitting of the 17th instant the Frankfort Diet deliberated on the joint protest of France and England. According to the *Cologne Gazette* it unanimously decided that it would not permit any foreign Government to interfere in this affair, which it regarded as exclusively German.

Letters from Lugo, in the Romagna, state that a commissary of the Roman police, named Baldani, has been found to have been an accomplice of Passatore, the celebrated brigand; he is at present under trial. The arrest of this man is said to have released some twenty young men from captivity, they having been incarcerated on account of an imaginary Mazzinian plot, invented by this Roman official. Such facts as these serve to throw a light on the state of things in that part of the peninsula. The Roman police always had a bad name, and deservedly so, as the above serves to show.

#### PERSECUTIONS OF FREILIGRATH: OUR PRUSSIAN ALLIES.

In our numbers of the 15th of February and 3rd of May last, we gave some account of the manner in which the German poet Freiligrath was at that time vexatiously persecuted by the Prussian Government, in spite of more than a year's retirement from all political activity. For the manner in which his nationality itself was disputed, we must refer to our former articles, merely reminding our readers that, after a complete defeat in their first endeavour to disprove his claim to be considered a Prussian at all, they referred him to the police authorities at Dusseldorf, to decide the question of his right to the

citizenship of that place, to insure which had been the sole aim of the previous litigation; thus involving him in a repetition before a lower court, of the prolonged and vexatious lawsuit which he had just brought to a successful termination in the higher, for no other purpose than to secure that which by the words of the law was expressly involved in the justice they had been unable to refuse him.

This evident endeavour to tire out and disgust him, and to produce either some indignant expression which might be made use of as a constructive treason, or so to weary down by a formally legal oppression a resistance that they could not legally overcome, in the hope that a voluntary expatriation would at last become preferable to a continually harassed existence in his native country, produced neither of the desired effects, but simply an indignant refusal to furnish to the police any further grounds in support of his claim to the citizenship of Dusseldorf, than he had already produced to establish his right to be considered a Prussian under conditions which rendered the refusal of the citizenship no longer possible.

After a fortnight's silence, the police authorities replied, that although he had established his claim in the most insufficient manner, they would no longer offer any opposition, and admitted him as citizen of Dusseldorf at last. This unconditional surrender, after a conflict of so many months, points unmistakably to collateral motives in entering upon the conflict at all. It cannot be supposed for an instant that the authorities had any doubt as to the state of the law, or as to what must be the result if the point were brought to a legal issue. It is manifest from this result, that the whole purpose and aim of their proceedings was to tire the poet out, and relieve themselves of a hated presence, either by his impudence or impatience; failing this desired end, they suffered (what they must have foreseen as at least possible) a complete and ignominious defeat.

But such conflicts fall more heavily on the victorious party than on the defeated, and leave even to success the thought only of escaping from such struggles. After Freiligrath had successfully carried his case through every form of defence, and in this manner done what he conceived his duty to his countrymen, by giving them an example of an oppressive Government defeated by their own laws; there still remained for him to consider his own future and that of his family. A Government which had given such notice of their intentions would clearly bring every future publication of his before their tribunals, with or without hope of conviction; for whether they were pronounced treasonable or not, the trial would at least place the means of provisional imprisonment at their command, and involve an expensive litigation which must in the long run ruin their opponent, if they should fail of speedier or more brilliant success.

These considerations induced Freiligrath, about the middle of last month, to apply for a passport for England, which, in the face of their recent defeat, they could not refuse in *optima forma*. Since his arrival in England he has published a second volume of *Political and Social Lyrics*, and great, no doubt, is the disappointment of his paternal Government, that they cannot at once lay hold of the poet, and imprison him during inquiry into their character. As it is, they have searched the house of a bookseller in Dusseldorf, with a view to find a pretext for imprisoning a friend, whose liberation could only be effected by the poet's surrender—and this in spite of an express notice on the cover of the little volume, that it was published by the author himself.

Their search, however, was ineffectual. After a few days another little army of police favoured the poet's wife, who lives alone in a small village near Dusseldorf, with a like domiciliary invasion, and were not content till they had examined the very pockets of that lady herself, in the hope of finding a copy of a work which was openly circulating with the author's public acknowledgment on its cover.

The purpose of such proceedings seems hardly to be guessed. A bookseller supposed to be friendly is harassed, and his wife intruded on by men with drawn swords, surely not to establish an authorship which is avowed on the book itself. Is it possible that the Government of a great country can descend to such practices from mere spleen, and vent its anger in such small persecutions? It seems incredible, but how else explain such supererogatory tyrannies?

We have seen in one of the *Cologne papers* a report, that a *private* warrant of arrest is out against Freiligrath, and that shortly he will be formally summoned to appear before the courts, to answer an indictment for treasonable expressions in his late book. These steps, if taken, will of course render his return to his native country an impossibility; for though to an English ear there is nothing in his book that would not pass as the natural expression of an advanced Democrat (indeed nearly half its bulk consists of translations from Barry Cornwall, Thomas Hood, and others), yet in the present reactionary state of things in Prussia, there can be but little doubt a conviction would ensue, and a consequent imprisonment of years at least.

On the whole it does not seem to us that the Prussian Government at all hope for his appearance

before the courts; it would much better answer their purpose, should he remain in England, and lose by his own non-appearance his right to Prussian citizenship, and consequent claim to the poor protection of Prussian law, as in that case they could treat him, should he ever return, as a foreigner, and make him live under the constant surveillance of the police where they pleased, and for no longer in any one place than they chose, ordering him to quit the country at twenty-four hours' notice whenever their wisdom or ill-feeling should prompt them to do so. Thus at last the Government remains master of the field, for few can hesitate between expatriation and imprisonment, and no one who has a family dependent upon his exertions. That some field may offer itself in England for those exertions we sincerely hope, and that in this country may be withdrawn the sting from the poet's own touching words to his children in anticipation of his present position:—

"Die Heimath bloss macht heimathlos  
Die Kinder ihres Dichters."

NOTE.—In Ernest Jones's "Notes to the People," some of the poems in question are translated with great spirit.

#### THE PEACE CONGRESS AT EXETER-HALL.

The sittings of this congress commenced on Tuesday. The hall was well filled; the attendance of foreign notables tolerably numerous; and a fair sprinkling of British members of Parliament appeared on the platform. Sir David Brewster presided this year, and his inaugural address was very fine, and his concluding description of the Crystal Palace eloquent. The characteristic act of the first day was the following resolution:—

"That it is the special and solemn duty of all ministers of religion, instructors of youth, and conductors of the public press, to employ their great influence in the diffusion of pacific principles and sentiments, and in eradicating from the minds of men those hereditary animosities and political and commercial jealousies which have been so often the cause of disastrous wars."

The speakers on the first day were—Reverends Angell James, W. Brock, Athanasius Coquerel, jun., and John Burnett; M. Jules Delbrouck, editor of the *New Educational Review*, at Paris, Don Mariano Soler, M. Vischer, and Dr. Beckwith.

The event of the second day was the speech of Mr. Cobden, who proposed the resolution against standing armaments:—

"That the standing armaments with which the Governments of Europe menace each other amid professions of mutual friendship and confidence, being a prolific source of social immorality, financial embarrassment, and national suffering, while they excite constant dissidence and irritation among the nations, this congress would earnestly urge upon the Governments the imperative necessity of entering upon a system of international disarmament."

He treated the whole question in that quiet, plain, practical style for which his speeches are distinguished. He said:—"All great advances had been carried by a system of propagandism—not by masses going forth, but single men, or a few; and these few would accomplish their aim in spite of opposition, if they were earnest and their cause was right." Public opinion was making way on this question. He felt that in the House, which listened to him now man patiently. He pointed out that the Continental powers were shy of fighting each other, and he prophesied that their standing armies would fall by their own weight. As to England, her attitude was more aggressive than that of any other nation. She had a chain of fortified posts all round the world. "They would find that in no history was it ever shown that a standing army had achieved liberty for any country." Just as Mr. Cobden finished, M. de Girardin entered the hall.

Mr. Henry Vincent moved the non-intervention resolution, maintaining that every state had an inviolate right to regulate its own affairs. There was another meeting on Thursday.

#### THE LATE DR. LINGARD.

The *Morning Chronicle* furnishes the following account of the Catholic Historian of England. We cannot help observing that it reads as if written by a Catholic:—

"He departed at the ripe old age of eighty-two, leaving behind him the reputation of an orthodox and enthusiastic Roman Catholic, but one who in his most learned and elaborate writings never wilfully sacrificed candour and truth to sectarian ends and religious narrowness of view. Dr. Lingard's historical writings were of course to a certain degree influenced by the point from which he looked, and the corresponding prepossessions with which he wrote. But weighty testimony has vouched for the candour and fairness of his views. Dr. Lingard, while pointing out the advantages derived in an early stage of civilisation from monachism, never attempted to wrap up the co-existent abuses; but, on the contrary, candidly acknowledged that certain evils almost inevitably spring out of certain advantages; and fairly and truly, and in the most thoroughly Catholic spirit, painted the one and the other. Had all ecclesiastical writers, indeed, been inspired by the philosophical and broadly tolerant and wisely and grandly beneficent spirit which prompted the historical works of Lingard, many a religious feud would have been averted, and many a drop of theologic blood spared. The illustrious deceased was one of the earliest to direct public attention back into the remote and then little known times of the Heptarchy. This was in his *History of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. When it was issued, Dr. Lingard was an obscure and hard-work-



priest, labouring among the collier population of Newcastle. The book came modestly into the world, bearing neither the impress of Albemarle-street nor the Row. It was indeed printed and published locally, but its learning and its philosophy, its richness of thought and its meekness of spirit speedily procured extended and permanent fame for the humble adventurer from the presses of the Tyne. Dr. Lingard was then in his thirty-seventh year. He had been born in 1769—a fruitful year, by the way, in great men. Both Wellington and Napoleon were born during its progress; but we may mention that Sir Walter Scott, whose birth has been attributed, by a recent annalist of the historian, to the same year, did not see the light until the year 1771. Young Lingard was one of the hard, clear, and persevering brains of Lancashire. He was early dedicated to the priesthood, and studied at that seminary so famous in the annals of modern English Catholicism, Douai. Having entered Holy Orders he returned home, and commenced his laborious duties as an earnest, anxious, working priest among the collier population of Northumberland. As we have seen, however, his sacred and official duties did not prevent his devoting a great portion of the mental powers with which he was gifted to the elucidation of the early ecclesiastical and ecclesiological condition of Great Britain. The work brought him fame, and to some extent the means of leisure. They were used nobly. The provincial priest conceived the grand design of the History of England, to be executed of course from the point of view prescribed naturally by his sympathies, and authoritatively by his creed. Into neither the merits nor the characteristics of that great work is it at all necessary now to enter. The former are acknowledged and appreciated—the latter are known and understood. Dr. Lingard's *Catholic History of England* is a legitimate and complete chronicle—adding, as it does, the annals of the kingdom, as seen by the light of the old faith, to the records, as written by the light of the new; and the records, we may add, inspired by the peculiar gleam of no creed whatever.

"The History of England in question was a work of great toil and research. In its progress the author spent much time in the noble library of the Vatican, and amongst the very curious collection of historical records left by the Stuarts, and now preserved at Rome. The first volume appeared thirteen years after the publication of the earlier and introductory work. The author was then the unobtrusive and beloved priest of the same little Lancashire village, that of Hornby, in which he died. Volume after volume of the great and national work in question came forth, but the author's fame never drew him from his retirement. He had no taste for ecclesiastical pomp, and no wish for ecclesiastical preferment. More than once his name was mentioned in connection with a cardinalship; but the great honours of the Old Faith were more often awarded to the bustling political intriguer of the day, than to the retired and unobtrusive professors of learned literature, and the non-political possessor of profound scholarship. Dr. Lingard has been described by those who knew him well, as equally remarkable for manly modesty and genuine independence of character. The public story of his life is the register of the success of his books. The man was a virtuous citizen and an earnest professor of his creed. The historian was a philosopher and a Christian in the widest and most elevated sense of the term."

This account, however, omits one important act of Dr. Lingard's literary life. The *Globe* says:—"Various publications have issued in a pamphlet form from his pen, but we wish to direct the attention of his co-religionists to a work which his death permits announcing as his own. We mean an English version of the New Testament, published anonymously by Dolman, in 1836, and which for accuracy, terseness, and truth, is far preferable to the very defective translation of Douai."

Dr. Lingard lived and died in a state of manly independence of the Court of Rome. All parties regret his loss, and acknowledge his worth.

We append the following interesting letter from the medical adviser of Dr. Lingard to Mr. Dolman, the publisher:—

"Lancaster, July 21, 1851.  
"Sir,—The late Dr. Lingard is represented in some newspaper as afraid of going to bed, because afraid to die."

"For many years, probably thirty or more, I have had the confidence of the venerated historian, as his medical adviser and friend. I beg to state that he never manifested, on any occasion whatever, an unreasonable fear of any kind. He was, in my humble judgment, as wise and good a man, his mind as highly cultivated and as thoroughly disciplined, as is attainable in this life."

"During the whole of his last illness he was uniformly cheerful, tranquil, and resigned. Not a word or gesture betrayed complaint, impatience, or dread of any kind."

"My religious creed is different from his and yours, and I am personally unknown to you; but I know that you were esteemed by Dr. Lingard, and am sure you will take an interest in his posthumous character. You will use this note, or any part of it, with or without my name, as you think proper."

"I remain, Sir, yours very faithfully,  
"CHRISTOPHER JOHNSON."

#### THE STORY OF ANN HICKS.

Few cases of official injustice in a petty way equal that of Ann Hicks. The story is briefly as follows:—Mrs. Hicks was brought before Mr. Hardwick, at the Marlborough-street Police Office, on Wednesday week last, on a charge of selling cakes and other delicacies near the Crystal Palace. In her defence she stated that she had exercised that calling in Hyde-park ever since she was five years old; that it was

hereditary in her family—her father and grandfather having both successively carried on the same trade on the same Royal domain; and that the privilege of keeping a stand for the traffic in question rested on an express Royal licence, granted to her grandfather by George II., in reward for the signal public service of helping to get that Monarch out of the Serpentine—there being no Royal Humane Society in those days. She further stated—what is, if possible, a yet more material fact in the history of the case—that, about seven years ago, when the present Duke of Newcastle was Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests, she received his permission—dictated, we may assume, by a considerate regard to the antecedent circumstances to which we have referred—to convert the family stall into a substantial stone lodge; and that she thereupon invested £130, the whole savings of her life, in the erection of the well-known "White Cottage," near the Serpentine. Soon after the building of the "Crystal Palace" was commenced, she received from Lord Seymour, to her amazement and dismay, a peremptory notice to quit, accompanied by the liberal announcement that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, in consideration of her ejection, were prepared to make her an allowance for house rent for a short period after her removal. The only reason given for this summary proceeding was, that "the board had immediate occasion for her removal." Mrs. Hicks, however, probably under the idea that some mistake had been committed, or possibly in the hope that a sense of justice might gradually return to the authorities, delayed for some little time to execute upon herself the dreadful sentence which had been passed upon her. She was accordingly served with a second and more imperious notice, together with a generous offer to remove her furniture gratis, and a considerate specification of the amount—five shillings a week—intended to be allowed to her for the space of one year. At last she was, it seems, ejected by force, and her house was pulled down. All her attempts to obtain compensation completely failed; the commissioners would not even give her, despite the kind interposition of Lord Dudley Stuart, the value of the materials of her confiscated tenement; and the next appearance of poor Mrs. Hicks was in Kensington-gardens—as the spirits of the departed are said to return to the spots they loved in life—"woebegone and very shabby in appearance, with a basket of three-a-penny cakes on her arm."

Now, we submit that while the heirs of the Duke of Schomberg, while the Pendletons, and other recipients of the public funds, large and small, continue to pocket sums yearly, for services rendered to former monarchs at critical junctures—while spies are paid and pimps rewarded, Ann Hicks, if not allowed to earn her living, without being a farthing expense to the public, by selling "refreshments" in the Park, ought at least to receive compensation for her property destroyed by order of Lord Seymour. But the hero of Kensington ride is beyond vulgar influences. Perhaps he will not be so well able to bear the stigma of a respectable public opinion. The subscriptions received at the police offices, by the *Times* and other journals, are so many verdicts returned against him of "guilty of unpardonable cruelty towards an honest and a helpless woman."

#### THE NORWICH MURDER.

At the Lambeth Police Court, on Monday, Sergeant George Quinners, an active officer belonging to the S division of police, accompanied by Mrs. Elizabeth Faucett, the wife of a mechanic, residing at No. 16, Alfred-place, Old Kent-road, attended before the Honourable G. C. Norton and made the following very singular statement:—Quinners said, that at the beginning of last month, a painter named Simon Richard Gouch was employed at the mansion of Baron de Goldsmid, Somer-hill, Tunbridge, and having represented himself as a single man, had offered marriage to Ann Bailey, a housemaid in the establishment of the baron. The young woman, having no reason to doubt his professions, consented to become his wife; and, having given regular notice, left her service on the 6th of June for London, accompanied by Gouch. On the 9th or 10th of June, the father of the young woman Bailey, and the father also of Mrs. Faucett, then present, received, at his residence at Newcastle-on-Tyne, a letter from Gouch, in which he stated that he had married his daughter, and that they were living very happy at No. 33, William-street, Hampstead-road. This letter Mr. Bailey forwarded to the wife of Gouch, who, he had ascertained, was then living at Walworth, and she on receipt of it at once proceeded to 33, William-street, Hampstead-road, and rushed into the apartment while the runaway couple were at breakfast. Some high words were heard above stairs. Gouch came down, and informed the landlady that in consequence of the unexpected death of an uncle, he must leave the house at once. Having paid the rent due, the three went away, carrying their luggage with them. Quinners made inquiries, and ascertained that on the same day Mrs. Gouch returned to her lodgings in Ann's-terrace, Walworth, with a female, who answered to the description of Ann Bailey, and

at once sent for Mr. Dick, a broker, to whom she sold the whole of her goods, with the exception of one bed and a few paintings. These latter articles she had carried into the Walworth-road, and, stopping a cab, had them placed on the top of that vehicle. She then drove off with the young woman, and from that time all trace was lost of them, as well as of Gouch himself.

Finding that Gouch's father, who is a Baptist minister, resided but a short distance from Norwich, that Gouch himself had served his apprenticeship in that city, and that Mrs. Gouch was also a native of that place, Quinners made inquiries at the Eastern Counties Railway, with a view of ascertaining if such persons had proceeded to Norwich at that time; but so great had been the traffic occasioned by the Exhibition, that he could get no trace of them beyond the fact, that on the day in question 3s. 6d. had been received for luggage to Norwich, and this would be about the amount that would be paid for the conveyance. One of the porters also informed him that he had observed a large deal box painted red amongst the Norwich luggage, and the young woman Bailey had a box precisely similar painted red. Quinners added that, in consequence of the strongly expressed opinion of Mrs. Faucett that the mutilated remains of a female body, found in the vicinity of Norwich, were those of her sister Ann, Mr. Robinson, the superintendent of the P division, had corresponded with Mr. P. M. Yarrington, the commissioner of police at Norwich; and the result was, that though the most diligent search had been made for Gouch, his wife, and the young woman Bailey, not the slightest traces of them could be discovered. An application was made to Mr. Gouch, who is represented to be a highly respectable man, and he declared that the last time he heard of his son was in April last, and he had not seen him a long time before, nor since. With respect to the parts of the human body found, supposed to have been that of a person murdered, a female, probably between the ages of fifteen and twenty-six, it was perfectly impossible to identify remains so mangled.

Mr. Norton asked Mrs. Faucett what her reasons were for thinking that the portions of a body found at Norwich were those of her sister?

Mrs. Faucett replied that the instant she read the account in the newspapers of the finding of portions of the body, a cold chill passed through her, and she then and still felt conscious that they belonged to the murdered remains of her sister. Besides, all the members of her family were seized with a similar feeling, and were equally confident with herself that her unfortunate sister had met with an untimely end, and that her body had been cut up and distributed about to prevent recognition. She added that Gouch was a profligate bad fellow, and that her sister was not the first, by many, whom he had seduced.

Mr. Norton admitted that the case was one of strong suspicion, and he knew of no better way of bringing the truth of the matter to light, than the publication of the statement made by the officer, and a description of the missing parties.

Gouch is described as being about thirty years of age, of tall and genteel appearance, his hair dark, with a spot of white or gray hair at top, no whiskers, and he was rather well-dressed. Mrs. Gouch is thirty-five years of age; she was light in hair and complexion, and rather short and thin; and Ann Bailey is described as being twenty-six years of age, tall, stout, and erect, she was good-looking, with a prominence in front of her throat, dark hair and hazel eyes, and she had lost several teeth from the front part of the upper jaw.

In addition to this statement the *Norwich Mercury* furnishes another fact. On Saturday last a man named Henry Layton, who was employed in mowing the grass in the churchyard of St. Peter, of Southgate, found a human foot, the left one, which had been concealed in the long grass. It had evidently lain there for some time, and had been cut off at the ankle joint. The toes were contracted in the same manner as those of the foot previously discovered at Lakenham. The feet in size and general appearance correspond exactly.

#### PERSONAL NEWS AND GOSSIP.

The Queen and her family went down to the Isle of Wight on Friday week, and has remained there up to the present time.

The gossip of the week has turned on the divorce cases and the failures of the City in its attempts to get up a bail. A regular controversy, warm and personal, has been raging in the *Times* ever since that fatal occurrence. Great complaints are made that what is called the "City mob" alone was invited. Neither Science, Literature, or Art, nothing but wealth was represented on the 9th. We are afraid there is great reason for these complaints.

Lord Stanley has left town for India. The Earl of Derby has been laid up with the gout.

When Lord Arundel and Surrey resigned his seat to make way for Mr. Strutt, John O'Connell also accepted the Chiltern Hundreds to make way for Lord Arundel. But Limerick will not be walked over for. A Mr. Russell has come out against the "Saxon lord."

Mr. David Salomons has written to the *Times*, contradicting a statement made by Mr. Reynolds in the

House, to the effect that Mr. Salomons had attended a Papal aggression meeting, and spoken severely against the Catholics. He holds views upon the question quite inconsistent with such conduct.

Mr. Mechi entertained a large party at Tiptree-heath Farm on Thursday. They were invited to inspect stock, implements, and farming operations. A select body connected with the agricultural department of the Exposition were present, and some interesting trials of new implements came off. The entertainment was decidedly successful. Among other distinguished guests the papers mention Prince Frederick of Holstein and Lord Ebrington.

A large meeting in the Tower Hamlets has carried, a resolution of "confidence" in Mr. George Thompson.

The Athenæum records, that Mrs. Jameson's name has been added to the pension list for £100 a year. As one who, by her very careful works in the cause of the beautiful and poetical arts, has done much to adorn female authorship, this recognition of Mrs. Jameson is especially welcome, as occurring in the reign of a female Sovereign.

The Emperor of Austria is expected at Milan in August.

The King of Naples has conferred the Cross of the Order of St. Janarius upon General Gêmeau.

According to letters from Rome, the Pope continues at Castel-Gandolfo.

Marshall Sebastiani died last week, at the age of 79. He was a native of Corsica, and the father of the Duchess de Praslin.

Count Nobili, military commandant of the Austrian forces at Bologna, is making a tour of inspection in Tuscany and the Modenese States.

The King of Sardinia and the Duke and Duchess of Genoa have subscribed among them 1500 francs towards paying the expenses of certain workmen whom it is proposed to send to the Exposition.

The King and Queen of Saxony are staying at Venice, but observe the most strict incognito. They travel under the name of Hohenstein, and have taken up their residence at the Hotel Danielli.

The Stockholm journals state that Mile. Jenny Lind "has just purchased one of the largest estates in Sweden, that of Beckershoerg, in the province of Nyköping." On the same authority it is said that "the last letters received by her friends in Sweden contradict positively the reports lately published of her approaching marriage." Of course!

Count Bocaré was executed at Mons on the 18th. Fully expecting a pardon, he was greatly surprised when informed that in two days he would die. His last hours, if we may believe the accounts, were passed in an alternation of fright and indifference. Finally his courage got the better of his weakness, and he died with great firmness, marching composedly to the scaffold, coolly complaining that one of the things with which he was strapped down cut him, and looking fixedly on the shining blade of the guillotine before it fell.

#### CRIMINAL CONVERSATION, DIVORCE, ETC.

The records of the assizes and of the police courts sometimes furnish stories as dramatic and extravagant as any detailed by the novelist. We have a group of cases before us, which illustrate in a lively manner the state of the relation between the sexes.

Edward White, a farmer in Lincolnshire, married a woman who had previously borne to him an illegitimate child. They did not lead a very happy life, nor did Mr. White behave to his wife in the most manly fashion imaginable. On one occasion, he locked her out of the house at night in the winter time; and on another, he locked her in the coal-cellar. She acted passionately, and he brutally; also, they occasionally swore at each other respectively. This was the kind of life they lived at the farm of Silk Willoughby. At a neighbouring farm lived a Mr. Faulkner, a schoolfellow of the Whites. He was accustomed to come over to Silk Willoughby, and in her troubles Mrs. White flew to the Faulknors. The result was, that a close intimacy sprang up between them. Mr. Faulkner frequently called when Mr. White was out. Servants peeping through the window between the blind and the sash saw them equivocally situated. One servant called her mistress a name which no woman ever bore with equanimity, except Nell Gwynn; and that servant was of course dismissed. Ultimately, Mrs. White falling ill, and thinking that she was about to die, confessed, it is said, to her husband, that she had acted improperly with Mr. Faulkner.

The case was so gross all round, Mr. White having attempted to seduce his wife's sister, one of the servants being with child, the open intercourse between Mr. Faulkner and Mrs. White, the acknowledged brutality of White himself, were facts so clearly brought out on the trial, that the judge intimated nothing but nominal damages could be expected, and only nominal damages were given.

Another instance, though of a widely different nature, is furnished by the assize proceedings at Cambridge. This case is very simple. Elizabeth Ann Parr was living with her mother and stepfather, and waited on the undergraduates who lodged in the house. She was only sixteen years old. On the 13th of March last, she went out to put up the shutters, when a gownsman came up and asked her to take a walk. She said nothing but entered the house. The man in academics followed, and entering the room of one of the lodgers, bolted the door, and threw the girl on the sofa. She fought at him, kicked him; from calling her a "little angel" he came to call

her a "little devil." The doorbell then rang, and the under-graduate jumped up from the sofa, the two went out and met Elizabeth Parr's mother on the stairs. On being told by her daughter that a "gentleman" had detained her in one of the rooms, she called her husband, and both went in pursuit. In the street the "gownsman" stood with his gown wrapped round him." Miller, the husband, asked what he had been doing in his house. Gownsman said, "Nothing." A policeman was appealed to, but declined to pursue the gown-wearer, who ran away. Miller followed, ascertained that the gownsman was named Henry Winteringham, had him arrested, and finally tried. The jury found him guilty, not of an attempt to commit a rape, but of a common assault. He was sentenced to be imprisoned in the borough gaol for three months—a severe lesson, most decidedly needed, for the undergraduates of both Universities.

In support of the Webster Divorce Bill, now before the House of Lords, some very striking points in the personal history of Mrs. Webster have been brought out.

She went to India as the wife of a gentleman named Mellish, her maiden name being unknown. When Mr. Mellish died, leaving two children, Captain Fitzroy-Somerset, soon afterwards killed at Ferozeshah, married Mrs. Mellish: and in 1850, at Paris, Mr. Webster made her his wife. As the friends of Mr. Webster and his wife could not agree, it was resolved to go on a cruise in the Zephyretta, a yacht belonging to Mr. Webster, up the Mediterranean; and a party was selected, consisting of two male friends, the daughter of Mrs. Webster, and her governess. One of these friends, Mr. Wingfield, was "a very intimate friend" of Mr. Webster. As the cruise proceeded a coolness arose on the part of Mrs. Webster. She refused to sleep with him; she called him an idiot and a brute; she damned him. It was observed that in proportion as she grew enraged with her husband, she showed unwarrantable tenderness for Mr. Wingfield. This tenderness developed itself in very questionable shapes; and, as the servants were on the look out, sights were seen which led to the departure of Mr. Wingfield and Mrs. Webster, to the action for adultery, and the present bill of divorce. The Nemesis of servants, which attends illicit lovers, was never more curiously illustrated than in this case. Elizabeth Davies said that while the yacht lay at Naples a party had been arranged for the opera. Mr. Wingfield and Mrs. Webster contrived to be left behind. Elizabeth Davies saw Mr. Wingfield in Mrs. Webster's cabin. She went for "needlework." Mr. Wingfield opened the door, which was locked. Mrs. Webster was sitting on the sofa undressed. On another occasion the governess did not go to the opera, and Elizabeth Davies was instructed to persuade her to go to bed. The same need for needlework impelled her again to Mrs. Webster's cabin. Again she found the door locked. Mrs. Webster opened it this time, with her dress disordered, and her hair hanging loose over her shoulders. The cushions of the sofa were thrown about. The valet spying down through a skylight was a witness to a scene in the cabin, which he next day described to Mr. Webster, who was much "astonished and surprised."

We have one case of breach of promise of marriage. Captain Boughey, a gay soldier in a marching regiment, was quartered at Hull, and there he fell in love with Sarah Ann Johnston, the pretty daughter of the landlord of the Royal Hotel. The parents discovering this sent Sarah Ann away to Chase, in Lincolnshire; whereupon Captain Boughey declared he would follow and make love to her there. In this state of things, the anxious parents thought it best to bring Sarah Ann back, and have the lovers under their own eyes. She came back; the gallant captain made a formal offer, was accepted, presented the lady with a ring, and otherwise behaved as a good and true lover should. Unfortunately the regiment went to Berwick, and Captain Boughey went with it. Here he suddenly found that his means were not great enough to authorize him to marry; and a project he had conceived, of exchanging into a Canada regiment, fell through; and he found that his friends bitterly opposed the match; in short, he found himself in a dreadful scrape, without the courage to do his duty, brave the difficulties, and marry the girl. The course he took in this juncture was to pay a visit to Miss Johnston, and get from her the ring aforesaid. This was not accomplished without difficulty, many tears, and great suffering on the part of the victimized girl. But the gallant captain did triumph in the end—over the woman to whom he had avowed his love, over her angry mother and indignant father. Yes he carried off the ring. An action was brought at York, on the 18th, to recover damages by Mr. Johnston; and the jury gave £300.

The most remarkable case is one which the police-court brings out into the light of day. Miss Annie Fowler, "a lady-like person about thirty years old," advertised for a situation two years ago, and being answered by a Dr. Berrington, who kept a large scholastic establishment in Buckinghamshire, she consulted her attorney, who entered into a negotia-

tion with the doctor; and, on the recommendation of her professional adviser, agreed to advance £200 to Dr. Berrington, and entered into his service as manager of his household. The reverend doctor's affairs becoming more involved, he was obliged eventually to break up his establishment, and became an inmate of Whitecross-street prison, when his maintenance, and that of his unfortunate children (six in number), in part devolved upon her; and subsequently to his release from that place, she had kept and sheltered the children for four months at one time, and frequently relieved him and them with money.

But Dr. Berrington had a wife, who seduced and ran away with a pupil in the school; and this woman, finding out Miss Fowler, haunted her house, demanding money, accusing her of cohabiting with the doctor, and making a great disturbance. For this Miss Fowler was at last obliged to give her into custody, and she was brought before Mr. Combe at Clerkenwell. The scene in court was very striking. Mr. Combe asked why Miss Fowler kept the children, and whether she was sure Dr. Berrington was a doctor in divinity. She replied that she kept the children from motives of compassion, and that she was convinced the doctor was in holy orders:—

"Mrs. Berrington (mournfully): Oh! thank you for treating my children with kindness, certainly; but why keep and conceal my husband from me?"

"Miss Fowler said she did not, adding: 'I have often, out of charity, given my money to send to you when you know you had no claim upon him, you having left his home with and seduced one of his pupils.' (Sensation.)"

"Mr. Combe (surprised): Is that a fact?"

"Mrs. Berrington (hanging down her head): Yes; I own it is too true."

"Mr. Combe: Then, surely, you have not much reason to find fault. What business have you, then, to go and annoy this young woman?"

"Mrs. Berrington said it was in consequence of a letter from one of her sons."

"Mr. Combe asked the age of the defendant's eldest child."

"Miss Fowler said it was nearly twenty."

"Mr. Combe remarked that it was a most lamentable and profligate case. Here was a woman—a wife of more than twenty years, and the mother of a numerous offspring, deserting them and a home for and with a lad who had been placed under her care to act a mother's part. And what was the consequence of her profligacy? Why, her present appearance showed too plainly a most just retribution."

No improper behaviour could be proved against Miss Fowler, who declared that she never saw Dr. Berrington unless he wanted money. The issue was that Mrs. Berrington, unable to find bail, was sent to prison.

#### LABOUR AFFRAY.

In the village of Rusholme, near Manchester, there is a brick-field belonging to Mr. Farr. For two years he has been in a state of constant hostility with the members of the Brickmakers' Trades' Union. Several times during that period they have invaded his field, thrown down his banks of bricks arranged for drying, and trampled out of shape the soft, or newly made bricks.

To repel these attacks or prevent them, he has lately employed watchmen, and armed them with old fowling-pieces, loaded with bullets and round shot. On Saturday morning, about half-past twelve, a.m., the watchers heard the trampling of feet and the murmurs of voices, evidently proceeding from a large body of men. The sentinels were soon aware of the approach of an armed force, estimated at 100, who entered the field and began a random fire of musketry upon the watchers, while their comrades commenced overthrowing and destroying the bricks. The sentinels, protected by the darkness and the shadow of the kilns returned the fire, which was answered on the part of their assailants by a shout of derision. But, in addition to the ordinary means of defence, Mr. Farr had mounted a small swivel cannon on a wall of dried bricks in such a way as to sweep the "flats" of bricks. This piece of ordnance was fired with great effect; for either by the noise it made, or the execution it did upon the foe, most likely both, it made them beat a rapid retreat. The police arrived too late. In the morning one dead man was found, a Unionist, who must have been killed by his comrades, and by a discharge at six paces. He was shot dead. The jury returned, however, a verdict of "Wilful murder."

A private watcher reports, that a body of men bearing a wounded companion, passed him on his beat near some unfinished houses. None of the invaders have been arrested.

#### JEWISH OATHS.

Baron Rothschild met his constituents on Thursday, at the London Tavern. There were twenty members of Parliament on the platform, and numerous City notables. The tone of the meeting was very high-spirited, and the resolutions and petition emphatic and decided. The Baron offered to resign; but his offer was rejected. Mr. Raikes Currie, M.P., was in the chair. The speakers were—Mr. John Dillon, Mr. J. J. Travers, Mr. Bernal Osborne, M.P., Mr. F. Bennock, Lord Dudley Stuart, M.P., Sir Henry Bateman, Mr. Aglionby, M.P., Mr. Anstey, M.P., and Alderman Salomons; the last



gentleman made a great impression by describing the situation in which his courage has placed him. He had foreseen the result, and had all along acted with the view of bringing the question before the courts. Now, he had voted three times; and two notices of action had been served on him:—

"For that imprudence I am liable to an action at law, and should a verdict be recorded against me, I shall be in this position—I shall forfeit the sum of £500, either in the aggregate, or for each vote, and I care very little which. (Loud cheers.) But that is not the whole of the penalty. If I am found guilty, I become a 'Popish recusant convict.' (Laughter.) Now, just hear what the law of the country is, as laid down by some lawyers in the House of Commons. If I become a 'Popish recusant convict,' I cannot take a legacy, I cannot sue, I cannot be the guardian of any child, I dare not vote at any election for a member of Parliament, every office I hold I shall be stripped of, I must lay down my aldermanic gown, be struck out of the commission of the peace, and become a sort of political Cain wandering throughout the land, a vagabond and fugitive. (Loud laughter.)"

The main resolution and the petition call upon Lord John Russell to make the abolition of the Abjuration Oath a Cabinet question, and to do it forthwith; also to pass a resolution in the House which will entitle Baron Rothschild, and of course Alderman Salomons, to take their seats.

Mr. Alderman Salomons met the electors of Greenwich, who received him with enthusiasm, on Thursday. He told them that he had already been served with "two notices of actions for having voted." The petition which Sir Benjamin Hall will present on Monday was adopted at this meeting.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

The last mail from Lisbon reached Southampton on the 23rd. The news speaks of the continuance of military disturbances.

A great meeting has been held at Manchester in favour of Kossuth and the Hungarian refugees. Dr. Vaughan spoke with great eloquence and ability.

We have to state that Mr. Gatiliff, the secretary of the "Society for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes," has written to the *Times*, intimating that it was he, and not Lord Ebrington, at whose suggestion the directors so absurdly prohibited the admission of woman into Metropolitan Chambers.

Mrs. Walter Lacy's first benefit will take place at the Haymarket Theatre on Thursday next.

A meeting of the Distressed Needlewomen's Society took place on Wednesday, in reference to the conduct of the honorary secretary, Mr. Roper, who, it is alleged, has been guilty of irregularities in his accounts. Mr. Roper did not attend to explain, and he was formally dismissed.

A public meeting was held on Monday, at Clerkenwell-green, for the purpose of adopting a memorial to Sir George Grey, requesting him to offer a reward for the apprehension of the policeman who killed the Irishman in Shoe-lane, City. The meeting was large, upwards of three thousand persons being present. Several police reporters were present, who took notes of the proceedings. All round the outskirts of the meeting a numerous body of policemen were stationed, but their assistance was not required, the meeting having behaved and dispersed in the most orderly manner.

Sir George Grey has called upon the Liverpool magistrates to show why the late riot was not prohibited; why, when the peace was broken no measures were taken to restore order; and why the police information was not more accurate. It is said that the magistrates were forewarned of the riot, but declined to interfere.

The Earl of Shaftesbury presided at the ceremony of the formal opening of the "King Edward Ragged and Industrial Schools and Eastern Refuge," on Wednesday, in Spitalfields. A great company, without distinction of sect or party, assembled; and the proceedings were followed up by a public meeting of the inhabitants in the evening.

William Pamplin, accused of being concerned in the gold-dust robbery on the South-Western Railway, has been found guilty of complicity, and transported for ten years.

The body of a man completely naked, the hands tied behind the back, and the face beaten so as to destroy all chance of identity, was found in a river near Youghal.

A Roman Catholic priest, who keeps a school at Islington, was held to bail to answer a charge of cruelty at the next Clerkenwell sessions. The case was very bad indeed. Gutta-percha whips had been used, and the boy was dreadfully beaten. The parents, who were Irish, manifested much more desire to shield the priest from punishment than to protect their child.

A "Welsh Clergyman" suggests, in the columns of the *Times*, a remedy for the anomalous state of the incomes of the Bishops:—"Let a short act be forced through both Houses of Parliament before they break up this summer, bringing every Bishop, without living exception, under the painful necessity of receiving only the number of thousands designed for his successor. If vested rights in a great wrong could ever have been decently pleaded, they are now forfeited. Twenty-four Cardinal Wismans in a row could not have injured the Church so much as these worldly wise men who wear our own mitres. Let the Parliament stave off their aggression before it recess. So will both great scandal be cut off and great good effected. If the plexony of our existing prelates has made an increase of the episcopate ridiculous, and an extension of church accommodation otherwise impossible, let the unrighteous excess of their incomes at least secure us the latter. In no other way are they likely to serve the Church."

In the South Hooe Lead and Silver mine, near Devonport, there is a steam-engine working underground, apparently without adequate provision being made for the escape of the smoke. Some of the miners were lately working a portion of the mine at the 95-fathom level which was considered dangerous in consequence of the smoke passing into it; but the miners persisted in working there; and the result was, that four were suffocated by the smoke, and one so much affected that life seemed extinct.

A young gentleman, named Fazackerley, and a friend, named Green, who was paying him a visit at his country-house, near Chorley, went down into a pit which it is said was known to be full of fire-damp by the underlooker, who, nevertheless, accompanied them, together with a sinker. They had not been down long when a rush of sulphureous gas up the shaft showed that an explosion had taken place. A crowd collected, amongst the rest young Billinge, the underlooker's son, who bravely ventured down with another man to search for his father. They returned much exhausted, satisfied that old Billinge was lying dead below. After great exertions in pumping out the water and getting fresh air into the pit the bodies were recovered.

Lord Shaftesbury has just laid on the table of the House of Lords, a bill for the further regulation of chimney-sweepers. It is proposed that no person under the age of 21 shall use the trade of a chimney-sweeper, unless duly apprenticed. Persons under 16 years are similarly prohibited, except to carry the apparatus. Penalties are to be imposed for disobeying the new regulations.

A Judge of Probate in Minnesota Territory, to whom a United States soldier at Fort Snelling recently made application for a discharge, on the ground that he could not find suitable quarters at the Fort for his wife, granted the discharge, and held that if the Government enlists a husband it must provide suitable accommodations for the wife; also, that every enlisted soldier may have a wife provided for.

### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

#### BIRTHS.

On the 4th of July, at Copenhagen, the wife of J. H. Drummond Hay, Esq., her Majesty's Chargé des Affaires in Morocco, of a daughter.

On the 15th, Mrs. Herbert, of Llanarth, of a son and heir.

On the 16th, at Albany, Surrey, the wife of Martin F. Tupper, Esq., of a daughter.

On the 16th, at Stoke Hamond, Bucks, the Lady Julia Bouwens, of a daughter.

On the 17th, Mrs. Henry Masterman, of a son.

On the 17th, at Erskine, Lady Blantyre, of a son and heir.

On the 21st, at Danesfield, Bucks, the Honourable Mrs. Scott Murray, of a daughter.

On the 22nd, in Newman-street, Oxford-street, the wife of Baron Celli, of the Royal Academy of Music, of a son.

On the 22nd, at Eton College, the wife of the Reverend Charles Old Goodford, of a son.

On the 23rd, the wife of Dr. Lankester, F.R.S., Old Burlington-street, of a son.

#### MARRIAGES.

On the 8th of July, at St. Mary-the-less, Durham, the Reverend Edward Greatorex, youngest son of the late Thomas Greatorex, Esq., F.R.S., F.L.S., to Elizabeth, third daughter of the Ven. Charles Thorp, D.D., Archdeacon of Durham.

On the 17th, by the Most Reverend Dr. McHale, at the residence of the bride's father, Joseph Kelly, Esq., son of the late James Kelly, Esq., of Newtown, county Galway, to Mary Ann, fourth daughter of Sir Michael D. Bellew, Baronet, of Mount Bellew, in the same county.

On the 19th, at St. James's, Westminster, Lieutenant-Colonel John Eardley Wilmot Inglis, of her Majesty's Thirty-second Regiment, son of the late Bishop of Nova Scotia, to Julia Selina, daughter of Sir Frederic Thesiger, M.P.

On the 19th, at St. George's, Hanover-square, by the Lord Bishop of Litchfield, John Forbes Clark, Esq., only son of Sir James Clark, Baronet, Attaché to her Majesty's Embassy at Paris, to Charlotte, only daughter of the late Mr. Justice Colman.

On the 21st, at St. Michael's Church, Highgate, the Honourable George Edwin Lascelles, third son of the Earl of Harwood, to the Lady Louisa Nina Murray, daughter of the Earl of Mansfield, K.T.

On the 23rd, at St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, Robert, second son of the late Henry Elwes, Esq., of C-lebourne, Gloucestershire, to Mary Frances, youngest daughter of the late Reverend R. Lucas, of Edithweston, Rutland.

On the 22nd, at Christ Church, Albany-street, Onley Savill Onley, Esq., of Stisted-hall, to Jane, daughter of William Fox, Esq., of Chester-terrace, Regent's-park.

On the 22nd, at the Roman Catholic Chapel, Warwick-street, Lord Edward Howard, son of the Duke of Norfolk, to Miss Talbot.

#### DEATHS.

On the 4th of July, at Montreal, while commanding the Royal Engineers, in Canada, Colonel H. W. Vavasour, of that corps.

On the 6th, at his residence, in Florence, the Marquis Ottavio degli Albizzi, after a severe illness of six days.

On the 14th, the Right Honourable the Earl of Charleville, aged fifty.

On the 17th, at 15, William-street, Lowndes-square, Clementina, wife of Captain Sir Frederick Nicolson, Bart., R.N., in her twenty-eighth year.

On the 17th, at her residence, 35, Camden-road-villas, Camden New-town, Elizabeth Monimia, aged fifty-eight, wife of Robert Burford, Esq., proprietor of the Panorama Royal, Leicester-square.

On the 18th, at No. 2, Upper Bedford-place, the Dowager Lady Mackworth, relict of the late Sir Digby Mackworth, Bart., in her eighty-fifth year.

On the 19th, at his house, 1, Upper Wimpole-street, aged fifty-nine, Francis Newman Rogers, Esq., Q.C., Bench of the Inner Temple and Recorder of Exeter.

On the 19th, at Pentre, Fembroskire, Elizabeth Maria, the beloved wife of D. A. Saunders Davies, Esq., M.P., for Carmarthenshire.

On the 19th, the Reverend A. Willis, M.A., master of the Grammar School, and preacher of the town of Ludlow, aged forty-six.

On the 21st, Henry Hawarden Gilliebrand Fazackerley, Esq., of Gilliebrand-hall and Fazackerley-house, Lancashire, in the twentieth year of his age.

On the 21st, at Badgebury-park, Kent, Louisa, Viscountess Beresford.

On the 22nd, at Kensington, G. J. Bentley, Esq., of the Admiralty, Somerset-house, aged 23.

### TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

Several letters have been received by our publisher complaining of the non-receipt of papers, or the non-arrival of the *Leader*, until Monday. We have made inquiry, and find that the errors have not arisen in our office. The Country Edition of the *Leader* is published on Friday, and the Town Edition on the Saturday, and Subscribers should be careful to specify which edition they wish to receive. Complaints of irregularity should be made to the particular news-agent supplying the paper, and if any difficulty should occur again it will be set right on application direct to our office, 10, Wellington-street, Strand, London.

It is impossible to acknowledge the mass of letters we receive. Their insertion is often delayed, owing to a press of matter; and when omitted it is frequently from reasons quite independent of the merits of the communication.

Communications should always be legibly written, and on one side of the paper only. If long, it increases the difficulty of finding space for them.

All letters for the Editor should be addressed to 10, Wellington-street, Strand, London.

## Postscript.

SATURDAY, July 26.

The gallant little opposition in the House of Lords to the Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill last night made a vigorous but unsuccessful stand upon the question of including Ireland in the bill. An attempt was made to cut short the debate; and we have the unusual spectacle of their lordships being accused of "clamour and impatience." Before the House went into Committee, Lord MONTAGUE moved, That it be an instruction to the Committee to insert a clause exempting Ireland from the bill. A discussion of course followed upon the interminable question as to how the bill would affect the functions of the bishops; Lord CAMOYS, Lord MONTAGUE, Viscount CANNING, and the Earl of St. GERMAN's contending that it would render illegal and void all their spiritual acts, that it would prevent even consecration, and introduce intolerable social evils; and the Lord CHANCELLOR, Lord CRANWORTH, and the Duke of ARGYLL asserting directly the converse. The Earl of St. German's, and even Lord Clanricarde, who supported the bill, were met by shouts of "Question;" and Lord LANSDOWNE, who rose to speak, was obliged to sit down on account of the clamorous shouts of "Divide," so impatient of opposition and even discussion were the tolerating majority. Lord Montague's motion was lost by 82 to 17.

After a short discussion upon the effect of the words "or otherwise" in the preamble upon the Scotch bishops, who would probably come under the operation of the act, were they not specially exempted by the third clause, the House went into committee. The first clause was vigorously contested, and the dissentients divided the committee, but the clause was carried by 77 to 26. On the second clause being put the Duke of ARGYLL proposed to leave out the words which gave power to a common informer to sue for the penalties. But there was an evident objection on the part of Ministers to send the bill again to the Commons, especially upon that ticklish point. The committee divided, however, and there were—

For the amendment, 26; against it, 61.  
Majority, 35.

The whole of the clauses being agreed to the House resumed.

The House of Commons had a morning sitting yesterday. In the evening Sir Benjamin Hall presented a petition from the Borough of Greenwich, praying to be heard at the bar by counsel, in support of the right of Mr. Salomons to take his seat in the House. Mr. Raikes Currie presented the petition from the electors of London, agreed to at the meeting on Thursday. Both petitions were ordered to be taken into consideration on Monday.

Mr. REYNOLDS took advantage of a motion for adjourning the House to enter into a lengthened statement respecting the delay of Irish business. The House listened with great impatience, and it was suggested that the honourable member was himself aggravating the evil. The remaining proceedings consisted of a debate on the second reading of the Patent Laws Amendment Bill, which was criticized as premature, and not at all satisfactory. Nevertheless it was read a second time without opposition.

After a smart debate and a division, the Metropolitan Intermment Advances Bill went through Committee. This is a bill empowering the Treasury to lend the Board of Health £130,000, for the purpose of purchasing the cemeteries at Brompton and Nunhead, which will enable them to close some graveyards. The metropolitan members, headed by Sir B. Hall, opposed the loan; but as without it the provisions of the Intermment Act of last session cannot, it was alleged, be carried out, a majority of Sanitary Reformers was found who voted the money.

The Select Committee on Newspaper Stamps have published their report. The conclusions of the report are directly favourable to the abolition of the stamp. They conclude that the stamp is no guarantee of respectability; that its repeal would improve the provincial press in

quality and extent of circulation; that "the newspaper stamp prohibits the existence of such newspapers as, from their price and character, would be valuable to the means and wants of the labouring classes." "Your committee consider it their duty to direct attention to the objections and abuses incident to the present system of newspaper stamps, arising from the difficulty of defining and determining the meaning of the term 'news;' to the inequalities which exist in the application of the Newspaper Stamp Act, and the anomalies and evasions that it occasions in postal arrangements; to the unfair competition to which stamped newspapers are exposed with unstamped publications; to the limitation imposed by the stamp upon the circulation of the best newspapers, and to the impediments which it throws in the way of the diffusion of useful knowledge regarding current and recent events among the poorer classes, which species of knowledge, relating to subjects which most obviously interest them, call out the intelligence by awakening the curiosity of those classes."

Mr. A. W. Stone, Secretary to the Ragged Schools, Edward Mews, Duke-street, Manchester-square, has written to the *Times*, enclosing a statement relative to the conduct of a Roman Catholic priest in respect of the said schools. His allegations are these:—A Roman Catholic priest came on the 16th to the ragged schools and seemed very solicitous to obtain the names of the children. Instead of going to the teacher, he asked the pupils; and when the teacher interfered, he asked to see the register. The teacher had no power to show it to him, and set off to fetch the landlord of the premises, and when they returned the priest made off. Outside a crowd collected, who began abusing the teacher, using disgusting language, pelting the school, the priest looking on without reproof. "The policeman had great trouble during the afternoon to keep them from the door. The women sent the children with the books to tear up before us; Bibles, Testaments, and the little reward books were all torn up opposite the school with horrible yells. In the evening there was a procession in Orchard-place with lighted candles, and the houses were all illuminated. The remainder of the books were all destroyed. A person passing through the court heard the beginning of the sermon, which was a reproof to the parents for sending their children to a Protestant school. He said they were going to hell as fast as they could. Previously to this there was perfect goodwill and kind feeling manifested towards us, but now a very different feeling is exhibited; alarming threats are made use of and every annoyance practised. Yesterday morning a quantity of disgusting filth was put on the door, and the keyhole filled with it, so that we had to pay a man to cleanse it before we could attempt an entrance. Several people collected round there, much delighted, and said it served us right; we had no business there; and one woman clapped her hands with joy. On Monday, when the children went out of school, the priest was standing near, and gave each child a picture of the 'Virgin and Child.' He again asked them why they came to a Protestant school. It is not surprising that the number of children is diminished, especially as I hear that a priest has been round to their parents to compel them, as their director, to remove their children, or that their names would be called from the altar."

The English delegates of the Peace Congress gave yesterday evening a *soirée* at Willis's Rooms, St. James's-square, to their foreign friends.

The Roman Catholic "bishops" of Salford and Plymouth were consecrated by Cardinal Wiseman, assisted by Dr. Paul Cullen, Primate of Ireland; Dr. Briggs, Bishop of Beverley; Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham; and Dr. Waring, Bishop of Northampton, on Friday, at Manchester.

Ann Bailey, the young woman respecting whom Mrs. Fawcett, her sister, made so strange a statement before Mr. Norton, entered the police-court on Thursday, was identified, and taken home by her brother-in-law. Mrs. Fawcett, it will be seen, had suspected that Ann Bailey had been murdered, and that it was her body which had been found in small pieces near Norwich.

Sarah Barber, who, it will be remembered, was accused of poisoning her husband, at Eastwood, near Nottingham, has been found guilty. Her paramour, Robert Ingram, was acquitted. She is sentenced to death without hope of mercy.

Two propositions to prorogue the French Assembly have been presented; one from August 18 to November 6, and the other from August 18 to October 20.

A "fast" young man died the other day at Pisa, disdaining of the good offices of the Church. He was told the Devil would claim him. He exacted a promise from a Corsican, his friend, that he would watch over his body until it was buried. The Corsican watched alone in the convent chapel. In the middle of the night came the Devil, hoofs, horns, and all. The Corsican asked him his business. The Devil groaned and stretched out his claws. The Corsican informed him that he must go, or he would speedily send him below. The Devil scornfully laughed; whereupon the Corsican drew a pistol, and coolly shot the Devil. The report of the pistol alarmed the police, and a number of those guardians of the night having appeared, they saw to their astonishment the corpse lying in its proper place, the Corsican sitting tranquilly by its side, and a bleeding mass covered with red and black, with a tremendous pair of horns and the well-known tail. Poor Devil! he turned out to be the "bellman" of the convent. The Corsican was tried, and acquitted, as he showed that in the Tuscan code there was no penalty attached to shooting the Devil, and as he persisted in saying that when he fired he believed he had to deal with his Satanic Majesty, and no mortal representative.

# The Leader.

SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1851.

## Public Affairs.

There is nothing so revolutionary, because there is nothing so unnatural and convulsive, as the strain to keep things fixed when all the world is by the very law of its creation in eternal progress.—DR. ARNOLD.

### GLADSTONE THE WITNESS.

A WITNESS has come forth against the iniquities of Absolutism in Naples, such as never yet joined in the denunciation, and we challenge that high-minded and chivalrous gentleman to take thought, at this moment, whether he will abandon the great enterprise on which he has entered, or pursue it to the end.

We do not seek to dictate to him the mode in which he shall pursue it; there is no need for such dictation, even if we had the right.

But most solemnly do we adjure him, before the period of inevitable further action arrives, the period of embarrassment and pressure, to consider the validity of the difficulties which will be suggested to him, the validity of the scruples which will arise to his own mind, when he is compelled to see, in all their nakedness, the influences that uphold the iniquitous system.

William Ewart Gladstone is a man remarkable among the most distinguished of our country and of this day. He has long been noted for his natural capacity of mind; friends have feared that his mind was even over-cultivated, and thus rendered fastidious, ultra-refined, extravagantly nice, prone to balance abstractions, and hindered in action. He had displayed much aptitude for practical statesmanship; he is reckoned among the advisers of the Sovereign; was the colleague and friend of the greatest statesman of our day, now departed; and perhaps shares, most strikingly, that statesman's outward disposition to be over-impressed by conventions and forms, while, still like his friend, he is most able among our known statesmen, in dealing with the things lying under those forms. Intellectually inclined to the Conservative side, he has displayed a strong heart, moral courage, and no little decision. Among leading statesmen, perhaps there is not one that can be placed above him. With the doubtful exceptions of the Duke of Wellington, Lord John Russell, and Sir James Graham, and possibly the Earl of Derby, no man holds a higher Parliamentary rank.

Now, this man has been to Naples, has seen, has observed, has inquired, has been impressed, and tells what he knows, simply and plainly. He tells it in English style, as it will impress Englishmen. What is it that he tells? He describes how the prisoners of Naples are treated; with a noble directness that elevates the filthy disclosure to the height of the sublimest eloquence, he describes how gentlemen are cast down to the condition of wild beasts in crowded dens; how they are condemned on baseless charges, got up by a class of witnesses that in this country we should call bloodmen; how they are condemned by venal judges pledged to condemn; and how there are thousands of such prisoners. Now the whole of "the Opposition" of the Parliament was incarcerated or driven into exile. Mr. Gladstone quotes the constitution guaranteeing freedom, representation, and fair trial to the Neapolitans; the oath by which the King swore "in the awful name of the Most High and Almighty God," to maintain that constitution still unrepealed.

And to whom was all this wrong done? To men, says Mr. Gladstone, like Lord John Russell, Sir James Graham, or Lord Aberdeen; to a people so mild and well disposed, that when, for four months, Naples was in the hands of its four hundred thousand inhabitants, not one of the more serious crimes was committed; not one, although long scores of vengeance might have been remembered.

For be it remembered this tale is not new, but only the witness to it. Pepe has told it. Thrice did the first Ferdinand swear, like the present, with tears, and protestations, to maintain the constitution;

Francis swore; and the second Ferdinand keeps up the shocking practice of swearing. And for three generations of the Bourbons have the Neapolitans endured what Mr. Gladstone now describes. When the Bourbon is in power, it is a reign of Jefferies, perpetuated and multiplied; when the People has been in power, it has been mercy, trust, kindness, even to that brutal Bourbon that "never dies."

We are not exaggerating, we are not colouring: the Englishman may understand what Naples is from what Jefferies was; only that our James the Second had but one Jefferies, Ferdinand has many; and our Jefferies had no prisons ready to his hands like those of Naples. It was thus after 1812, thus after 1821, it is thus after 1848, thus in 1851.

Is not this horrible?

Now, why is it? Could not the Neapolitans right themselves? Unquestionably: *they have done it*. But then have they been betrayed by foreigners. Ferdinand the First swore to the Constitution won by the Neapolitans, went to Laybach, and returned with Austrians; Francis playing traitor to keep open the path for the foreign enemy—supplying his own soldiers with worthless weapons to make their defeat the surer. France and England both have to answer for treachery in that region.

On whom does the perjured Ferdinand, whose power maintains this horrible system of Jefferies—on whom does he rely? On Austria. Austria is ready to put down any rebellion; and while she is busy at that work, Prussia will do the work of Austria in the North. France will fill up the gaps. And Russia is behind.

Mr. Gladstone should ask himself whether this horrible system, which he so justly and nobly denounces, could subsist, if it were not for the combined powers of Absolutism.

He would leave questions of government to be settled, as internal questions, between sovereign and people: are they so left in Naples?

But there is another, and for Englishmen a more formidable question: what part has our Government taken to counteract that Jefferies system, or to uphold it? We are forced by such facts as have come out, and by the secrecy in which the rest are veiled, to believe that our Government has practically helped to maintain that horrible system, and that it *intentionally* maintained the authors of that system. Is Mr. Gladstone prepared to face that question?

He should be so. We need not labour to make him feel the misery inflicted on that beautiful country whence he has just returned; we need not urge upon him that some nobleness is still left in her sons, some capacity for the enjoyments and the duties of life, some faculty for obeying the Divine behests in promoting the welfare of mankind; we need not exhort him to learn the truth of the tales of Neapolitan prisons; we need not intreat him to inquire whether there are not inhuman tyrannies also in Sicily, in Rome, in Lombardy; we need not incite his imagination to call up the aggregate suffering inflicted in that renowned land, generation after generation, since the day when Napoleon cheated Venice out of her ancient constitution, even as England cheated Sicily out of hers. We need not urge these reflections upon him, for his own mind will do the work better than we can; but we do implore him to reflect upon the power which opportunity, which the gifts of God, which the dictates of his own heart, which the sympathy of Europe conspire to place in his hands; we implore him to dare to survey the good that he might do, if he pursue his high and chivalrous enterprise, if he persist until he exposes the whole of the wrong that oppresses unhappy Italy. He has described the wrong: what would not Italy be if that wrong were removed from the land? what happiness to millions even of those who now live, and of those who are to come, if that Jefferies-system were not to be upheld and were merely to cease?

He has persevered; he has faced the first aspect of some of those huge questions, and has not turned back; he has tried private remonstrance with the Government of Naples; he has ascertained, in his own case, how the claims of justice are met by the organized multimiform Jefferies of Italy; he has braved some of the consequences of a public denunciation; he has done a great service to Italy, to Europe, and to mankind; but there is a future, and in that also is there renown for him to win—nay, let us say rather, in that also is there good for him to do as the friend of his race, as a servant of God.



## HOW TO PUSH REFORMS FOR "NEXT SESSION."

It is as well to bear in mind the hints which Lord John Russell has thrown out as to the points which a new Reform Bill may contain. Not because we regard those hints as pledges, or expect to see his bill of "next session" come up to implied promises, which will have served his purpose when the general election shall be over; but because they are admissions available for those who will know how to use the disappointment which his bill must create.

1. He has hinted that a new Reform Bill should give a larger extension of the suffrage than Mr. Locke King's bill would have given.
2. It must include some direct representation of "the working-classes."
3. He does not think it necessary to retain the property qualification for Members.

This is decided progress. The ballot has always been "an open question," and the House of Commons has twice been pledged to it. Even payment of Members Lord John now objects to in a defensive tone which is very tempting to aggressive expectancy. The *Times* talks of Scarborough as if the distribution of electoral districts must be so far altered as to do away with boroughs servile through their smallness. And the Ministerial *Globe* has spoken of universal suffrage as the only alternative to the Russell bill; whence hardy expecters might anticipate that, if Lord John Russell were defeated, he would, in opposition, stand up for the Charter. And we believe it quite possible.

What he said about tenant-right on Saturday—how he had been prevented from acting on behalf of the Irish tenants by the extreme views of some parties—implies that if he were in opposition he would be very available for the new land movement in the sister island.

We want so bold and clear-sighted a man in Opposition; there is none such at present; and on the Speaker's left hand, Lord John would find himself once more without a rival. We quite sympathize with his impatience to be there.

Not that he exhibits that impatience. No; he conceals it with the stoical fortitude of the Spartan boy, who would not display the stolen fox, although it was gnawing his vitals. So Lord John lets impatience be in Opposition at his heart, and keeps up all the while a countenance as if he were quite pleased to be in office. You might almost think he liked it. Nay; he gets up an appearance of being fond of it, even as Scheherazade was fond of life. Under sentence of death, she perpetually put off the execution of her sentence day after day, by promising to tell her Sultan another beautiful story "to-morrow night"; and her sister always took care to demand that beautiful story. So Lord John promises beautiful measures for "next session"; and the press is his Dinarzade. So it was when he was officially decapitated in 1841: he was just about to introduce his beautiful sugar plan, his corn-law repeal, and all the rest of it.

But besides the well-known fact, that Lord John governs ten times better in Opposition than he does in office, there is the other reason which we mentioned last week—that some persons are wanted whose vocation it is to be in office, in order that they may a little set to rights the deplorable confusion of public affairs. This process seems to be necessary before anything can be done. Some twenty years ago, according to gossip then current, a very distinguished regiment made its barracks so filthy, that no other liked to come after it; and another regiment, it was said, actually did mutiny at the sight of the cleaning bout bequeathed to it; just as Lord Stanley and his party mutinied in the last "Ministerial crisis" at the sight of the state in which the public offices were to be left. Still, in such cases, on sanitary and other grounds, it is very necessary to have a change of regiments. And in the present case, preeminently so. Entangled as Lord John is with the revolt-inciting Grey for Colonial Minister—with a member of the Austrian Detective Force in plain clothes for Foreign Minister—with truth-loving, consistent-Radical Hawes, for the model man of the Cabinet—with a whole dustheap of old measures and their wrecks—the three or four Anti-Papal Bills, besides the cuckoo's "nest egg," which he will "carry" under the name—with the Poor Law Bills, which are said to have grown quite out of date and mouldy in the closet—with the Law Amendment Bills and Chancery Reforms, which have been clipped and shifted until he has quite lost count, and does not know which is which—with the Budgets, past, present, and to

come, and the income tax, and his own mind not made up about all those terrible schedules—with Finality and Progress—with Bishops, Romish, Romanizing, and Anti-Romish—with Durham letters and old speeches about the puerility of minding territorial titles—with royal speeches about agricultural distress and no pitch hot—with crotchety Lord Grey as cross as two sticks, and threatening to resign every time one talks reason to him—with Lord Truro for Chancellor, as bad as Cottenham for spoiling law reform dodges—with a Privy Council settling spiritual affairs, and an Archbishop declaring that that is not his place—with Lord Lansdowne wanting to wash his hands of it all, and those cursed Irish Members not noticing any wishes to be quiet—with "independent" Liberal Members so pliant that they can't get up the slightest pressure from without—with that plaguy Cape standing up for its rights, and Canada getting obstructive about the clergy reserves, and Australia angry about the transportation delusions—with the Customs convicted of [but we must not venture upon libels, so we will call it] erroneous proceedings against great public companies—with every public department in disorder, every class of measures in such confusion that the official authors have clean forgotten what they themselves meant, finance in an impracticable state of *hitch* for "next session," and all sorts of promises standing over—with all these incidents of utter embarrassment and disorder, unquestionably the thing wanted is a change of regiments to clean the barracks and put the furniture straight. Can we get on without it?

## PRIVILEGES OF A GENTLEMAN.

If innumerable instances of individual failure, perpetually coming before the public in the papers, were not sufficient to cast clouds of doubt over the honourable estate of matrimony, the pleadings of the bar in cases of breach of promise might be taken as the greatest libel on the institution. Look at the defence by Mr. Sergeant Wilkins in the case of "Johnston *versus* Boughiey." We need not meddle with the merits of the case itself, as disclosed in the evidence; we are not criticising Mr. Wilkins's professional merits, which are probably considerable; we simply extract from his speech, that statement which he presented to the jury as a narrative of just and manly conduct.

Miss Johnston is a young lady, twenty years of age, the daughter of an hotel keeper at Hull. Mr. Wilkins could say nothing to disparage her character. The defendant is twenty-nine years of age, "good-looking, well brought up, carefully educated," "of distinguished appearance, of ancient family, of large family connections, of great elegance of manners, and poor—a captain in the army;" "a gentleman and a man of honour." He proposed on the second day after seeing the lady; there was a courtship of ten days, and then Captain Boughiey went, with his regiment, to Berwick, whence he wrote letters which gradually cooled, until he broke off the match at a final interview for that purpose. The young lady's father had once kept a "gin-shop." Mr. Wilkins admitted that there was not anything disgraceful in his doing so, or in his afterwards being able to keep the Royal Hotel. Then why did he state it? He stated it—we quote his own words—"not to justify, but to exonerate the defendant." "The plaintiff's parents were too ready to encourage the defendant's attention to their daughter."

"The letters put in showed little more than the relation of a barrack life, and were more about catching trout than of affection to the plaintiff. The very moment the offer was made it had been accepted. What would have been the position of the plaintiff had the defendant married her? Where a man married into a family below his own, the members of his family passed the wife by; she was slighted, and the necessary consequence was that their happiness was marred; and although young ladies might indulge in the chimera of love in a cottage, men of the world knew well that poverty under circumstances such as this case presented, did not conduce to happiness. The defendant, no doubt, had been remonstrated with, and it had been impressed upon him, that he had nothing to depend on but his pay in the army. The natural consequence would have been that he must have sold out, when he would have been unfit for any other occupation. The money which his commission would have produced would have been soon gone, the reproaches and coldness of his family would beget coldness from him and between them, and a life of misery and unhappiness would have been the result. He thought the jury would conclude with him, that the defendant had acted wisely in doing as he had done, and that,

so far from having acted with barbarity, his conduct showed from beginning to end, that he was making a sacrifice of his own feelings and affection to his sense of right to her. In all respects the union would have been an incompatible one. He would have been shocked by her gaucheries in the drawing-room, though what she did would be proper enough in her own station in life; and this also would have led to discontent and coldness between them."

Mr. Wilkins had previously said of the young lady, "There she stood, at a time of life when impressions of this kind were soon obliterated, with the whole world before her, and not much damaged by what had occurred!"

Nothing is said against the young lady, her conduct seems to have been irreproachable, her appearance engaging—until vexation "damaged" her, but "not much," as Wilkins avers. The defendant is "a gentleman and a man of honour," an officer of manner that show his distinguished birth,—precisely the man, according to Wilkins, to attract affection and confidence; he offers his hand and proposes marriage, but the lady's father had been an innkeeper—which the captain knew from the first; "the very moment the offer had been made, it had been accepted"; the captain had been reminded that he had only his pay to look to, "he would have been shocked by her gaucheries in the drawing-room." Such are the reasons, according to Mr. Wilkins, which justify "a gentleman and a man of honour" in breaking off an engagement with a lady. We do not know that the Captain would have urged this plea with his own lips; we do not know that Mr. Wilkins would have done so personally; it was done professionally. The jury took a graver view of the compact, and rated its breach at £300. Licence to sport with the feelings of young ladies, even though the ladies be no better than innkeepers' daughters, are growing more expensive than shooting licences for the season.

## REALITIES.

SOMETIMES the Pensive Public seems bitten by the desire to play at politics, and to recreate itself among fantastical imaginations of things, as if tired of realities; and this symptom will exhibit itself in several members of the body politic at once, or even in more than one country.

Here is our own House of Commons playing at keeping up the exclusion of Jews, when we all know that the game is over. The honourable Members repeated the old discussion, turning on a few words which were not meant to keep out the Jews, and are not material to the object of the oath, which is to keep out the Pope and Popish Princes. What a spectacle! Members are solemnly standing askew of the question, and manfully opposing Mr. Salomons, lest they infringe the principle of the Act of Settlement, and let in Victor Emanuel, of Sardinia, to oust Queen Victoria; King Victor Emanuel having no thought of rivaling her most gracious Majesty, no connection with Mr. Alderman Salomons, no plan of creeping on to the British throne through Lord John's Jew Bill; nor has Lord John offered the said throne to the said Victor Emanuel.

Again, the House of Commons is standing out as manfully as if it had not five times agreed to let in Jews; five times hath Lord John Russell voted, and now he cannot abide Mr. Salomons's getting in; and the House is as obstinate as if the Jews would not soon be there, sitting, speaking, and voting, as naturally as if they had done it since the Reform Bill.

Over the water, there is the National Assembly of France resisting aggression on the Republic, just as if there were not going to be a stand up fight in May next. You would think from their manner, that they were settling it all now, with speeches and votes!

One of their cleverest men, who lives in revolutions, and is cut out by nature for a soldier, comes over to the Peace Congress, which is sitting solemnly in Exeter Hall, to censure political thunderstorms. The Great Bear of the North, say the gentlemen in broad-brims, should not growl and hug, for it is wicked; but if he does, naughty men must not do so in turn: good Christians should like to be hugged; when one cheek is smitten, turn the other; war is expensive and wasteful, nasty, horrid; and so at Exeter-hall they "resolve" to leave off fighting. With 1852 brewing!

M. "Delbrook" lays great stress on the immoral tendency of letting little boys play at soldiers, or girls dress their dolls in finery: it is thus, he says, that girls learn coquettishness and boys love of war. M. Delbrook, editor of the *Revue de l'Édu-*

cation Nouvelle, we surmise, is no physiologist, no phrenologist: his science of man excludes original instincts. But his system of education includes dolls, who are to stand up in class, and be instructively dressed. And Mr. Cobden joins these gentlemen, as practical politicians! Exeter-hall was enormously crowded; as much so as at the Wesleyan reform meeting, or a performance of *Elijah*; such is the striking vanity of tastes!

Kingsley preaches a sermon on "Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality," as the practical teaching of the Bible; the parish incumbent denounces the doctrine thus delivered, by invitation, from his own pulpit; the denounced sermon is published, and never was sermon more sought. We have heard of men coming up to town on purpose to buy it, curious to see what had been thus denounced, and learn all about it; and then much impressed with the contents. This is not apologetical. The Bishops are not meddling to find the concordance between the French revolutionary motto and the doctrine of the Scriptures: they are waging the combat with Mr. Horsman, who is assailing their incomes.

The Peers have been discussing the Papal Aggression, which Lord John Russell sent his father-in-law to Rome to be surprised at, though he knew it all before; and Lord John was surprised into his Durham letter, poor man! and now finds out his mistake; though his father-in-law, being deaf, did not hear at Rome what he went to Rome to hear, and so knew nothing about it when he came back.

But Lord Palmerston interfered on behalf of Sicily with such effect, that Sicily was prevented from escaping out of Neapolitan clutches; and Mr. More O'Ferrall would not admit into Malta refugees flying from Italian persecution, such as Mr. Gladstone has just been disclosing; but Lord Palmerston is the "Liberal" Minister of England, always maintaining English influence, always sympathizing with national efforts for freedom, always victorious; while Mr. Gladstone is a Tory, and in the last Ministerial crisis England all but escaped being under his rule, God save us! What an escape, too, for Europe and the patriots thereof! But England is a practical nation; she knows what progress is, and how useful it is to defend freedom wherever it is attacked. The place to attack the Pope is London: in Rome, "scatter his enemies." "Principis obsta"—keep out Gladstone and Aberdeen, keep in Minto and Palmerston, or the Pope will ride roughshod over Europe, Naples will resume her tyranny, Austria will again be dominant, and Russia will threaten Europe. From all of which we are saved now. So keep in Palmerston, keep out the Jews and the Pope; do not let little girls dress their dolls in finery; prevent little Britons from learning how to use a sword even in fun, or there may be horrid war, and you may cut your finger! Think of that, Master Brook!

#### MR. CONINGHAM AT BRIGHTON.

MR. CONINGHAM is to follow up his lecture at St. Martin's-hall, on the Working Associations of Paris, with one on the same subject in the Town-hall at Brighton. A small portion of the facts stated in these lectures has already been conveyed to our readers, and we shall be able to give more.

We watch Mr. Coningham's labours with the greatest interest. The facts which he has collected with so much industry are of the utmost importance, not only in making proselytes to the great principle of Concert, or in showing the working-classes the key to their emancipation; but also in showing to other classes how transition can be rendered safe, as it may be by that principle alone; and still more, in showing to confirmed Socialists how their principle may be applied, at once, to the existing state of things. In the present stage, no service can be more useful than that now so zealously and ably rendered by Mr. Coningham.\*

#### SOCIAL REFORM.

EXPLANATION TO SOME OF MY OBJECTORS..

July 22, 1851.

NOT many perhaps have been more favoured with advice and friendly strictures than I have; and if I reply to some of my objectors now, it is not only that I may testify the thankful spirit in which I receive their counsel, but also that the more numerous class of friends whom they represent may be furnished with a coup d'œil of the course which I am pursuing.

\* The *Daily News* has noticed the lectures in an able controversial article. We shall recur to this next week.

One friend particularly calls for such reply by complaining that, while I object to much that exists, and talk about the principle of Concert as a panacea, I am not specific enough in what I recommend for applying that principle. Several object to my meddling at all with the subject of religion, and they object mainly for these three reasons:—That there is no necessity for agitation where the religious world is spontaneously though gradually working out all the change which could be desired; that if I were not to speak on the subject at all, I should be able to insinuate opinions on political or economical subjects where I now arouse antagonism; and, thirdly, that it is better to omit religion altogether, since it is a perfectly obsolete, exploded, and useless fallacy. One most esteemed friend objects that I am far too hasty; that haste endangers reaction; and that all the conduct of progress had better be left in the hands of Lord John Russell, who is the most advanced man of his day, and who knows precisely the amount of speed which the world will bear. Some object that I do not speak out enough to justify my boast of open speaking, and call upon me for a confession of faith on all sorts of subjects "in your number of next Saturday;" some, that I am not Democratic enough; others, that I am too warlike. And one most valued coadjutor in the good cause calls upon me to renew the definition of Communism, reminding me of two that I have already given.

Now, it would be impracticable within the limits of a newspaper letter, to make a new confession of faith on all questions; and I know that it is very bad journalism to dwell at length on subjects that are not brought before the public by the natural course of events.

Let me say, however, that I am compelled to deal with the subject of religion; because the whole of society in France, but still more in this country and Germany, and if less generally not less profoundly in Italy, is disturbed by movements of inquiry into spiritual truth, and thus religion becomes one of those elements in the events and movements of the day which the journalist is bound to consider. It appears to me that the excessive disruption of churches and sects—which is dividing each one into many, and the so-called National Church into almost as many separate parts as there are sects without her pale—has attained such extremity, that the very number of partitions is beginning to neutralize sectarianism. I find some corroboration of this idea in my personal experience; for although I frankly avow, as I have done in previous letters, that my convictions will not let me attach myself to any dogmatic Church whatever, I am far from encountering any personal inconvenience through that frankness; on the contrary, I meet with something more than "charity" and "toleration"—I meet with the frankest disposition to discuss such subjects, when they are handled reverentially, on equal grounds. I am, therefore, firmly convinced that the day has gone by when any danger is to be apprehended from open speaking on the subject of religion. Nay, much more—I find a disposition to act in harmony among men of the most widely severed persuasions; I am myself habitually permitted to act with men of every conceivable degree in the range of opinions, from orthodoxy and evangelicism to the most opposite extremity; I see in all quarters a disposition to combined action—in the otherwise hateful anti-papal agitation, I see Dissenter acting with Churchman on the ground of common Protestantism; at one of the most crowded meetings I ever beheld in Exeter hall, I heard the leaders of the Wesleyan Reformers unanimously hailing the co-operation of John Bright and Edward Miall; and by the side of the Sovereign, I see a man whose public speeches, however brief they may have been, indicate a wise and truly Catholic spirit that might breathe from the pages of the greatest of living philosophers, his countryman Humboldt. In these and in many other social phenomena, I cannot help thinking that I discern, on the one hand, a general tendency to override dogmatic differences, and to seek unity on the common ground of the broadest truths in the instincts of religion; and on the other hand, a general desire to restore that great influence, by the only process that is possible in modern times, as one of the instruments for the elevation and con-

duct of society. Although some fantastical speculators may speak of religion as antagonistic to morals, few practical minds will fail to recognize in a truly Catholic religion—that is, in a conscious sense of the power and beneficence of the Creator—an incentive to well-doing in the creature which is not only strong in itself, but more perfectly compatible than any other element of social guidance with political and intellectual freedom. As a sublime illustration, I would point to the pages of that teacher whom I have already named, where science attains the inspiration of the most exalted piety, and claims for its practical end the good government of man.

If you ask me what practical measures I would suggest, I would say, in the first place, do all that you can to promote that feeling of brotherhood which is so rapidly surmounting the manifold pale of sectarianism. In the second place, do what you can to promote real religious freedom: every Church or sect is an embodied endeavour to attain to the truth; the progress of the body thus incorporated will be best expedited, if the members are able to work out the proposition for themselves; and to that end every Church should be allowed the freest and fairest opportunity to develop itself. Exclusive privileges are not very consistent with that freedom; but it is better to proceed by constructive than destructive means: while the Church of England should be supplied with the machinery of Convocation, and all that it needs to assert or define itself, perhaps the day may arrive more speedily than some of us expect, when the Act of Uniformity will be recognized as an inconvenient trammel of sectarianism and a bar to real unity. To sum up—I would cultivate unsectarian fellowship; I would aid every Church to obtain all that it needs, within itself, for its own development; and as an ulterior object, I would work for the removal of all factitious barriers to unity, the Act of Uniformity among them.

As to my being impatient and warlike, this I have to say, in brief. Knowing that the greatest number of the people, in this as in every other country, suffer from hardship and privation; believing that their bad condition arises from causes that are artificial and can be removed; and believing that a beginning in that amendment might be made at once, I am not disposed to wait for the slow convictions of men who have a less intimate acquaintance with the wants of the people, or who have studied less closely the removal of injurious causes. I have as yet but little power; but I do my best to proclaim among the working-classes that their condition is rendered worse than it needs be through causes which subsist by the deliberate intention of their rulers. That is no more than a very naked representation of the fact; and the working-classes show great aptitude for perceiving it.

Again, I find that in no country, not excepting England, would the working-classes consent to be so downcast, if they were not kept down by physical force—the organized physical force of standing armies; the several Governments of Europe combining together the better to keep down the peoples in detail. Now, this result would be impossible if the peoples were all aroused to a conscious "ass of their own position and their own aggregate strength, and united for the attainment of a common freedom. The nation that would be free must be strong. All government is power; and that people will be most popularly governed which possesses the most power within itself.

It is one of the bad results of a standing army that it denationalizes the power of a country, transferring it all to the possession of a bureau, and placing the People entirely at the mercy of that bureau. In that view, I desire by gradual means to lessen the amount of the standing army, and to transfer a part of the service of defence which is expected from a standing army, to a body of citizens. There is nothing very fierce in that; indeed, it is the only practicable mode of carrying out the reductions of military expenditure desired by Financial Reformers.

The old economists of the books have made two serious presumptions, which have had a grave effect in the practical conduct of Government. Professedly their doctrine is limited to the theory of the accumulation of wealth, excluding moral considerations; but they have presumed that the necessary impulse to industry cannot be given without competition. Some years ago I pointed out that one incentive to industry is the compulsion under which most men living in society feel to do "what is usual," including the routine of employment; and in his recent work on Political Economy,



John Mill has recognized this effect of what he names "custom." The experience of the Rappites, however, independently of the religious influence which brings them together, the illustration of the Sheffield workhouse, and many personal experiences which must occur to the candid man, all tend to the conclusion that competition is neither the sole nor the principal incentive to work; but that a satisfaction in doing that which is right, love of approbation, and many other motives equally concur.

Another presumption is, that by means of competition, production not only attains its greatest amount, but most fitly suits the wants of the people at a given time. This presumption is disproved by the enormous waste which takes place in trade under the competition for custom, and by the unmistakable fact which stares us in the face, that large numbers of people are unfed, while large numbers are out of work, and large extents of land are uncultivated or half cultivated. Such facts establish, beyond a doubt, the further fact, that competition fails to direct industry, or to extract from it the largest possible amount.

The fundamental principle of Coöperation, Association, Communism, or whatever you please to call it, is *Concert*. Adam Smith showed the superior productive power of what he called "division of labour"; Edward Gibbon Wakefield showed that "combination of labour" is necessary to the "division of employments"; to which canon I add, that, in order to secure the full profit of divided employments, it is necessary that there should be "concert in division of employments." This is the real definition of the principle. The statement that it renders the principle of assurance universal, describes the effect rather than defines the principle. There are various modes in which any principle may be applied; but in respect of the larger schemes for converting the whole of society into a coöperative system, it has always appeared to me that we have not yet attained sufficient knowledge to make laws for so totally altered a condition of society. Having ascertained the economical principle, our business is to apply it as speedily and as efficiently as we can. That the principle is making rapid progress in general recognition, is seen, not only by the immense increase of organizations in Paris, but the numerous organizations already existing in England, by the endeavour now made to establish a central agency for those organizations, and by the spread of a conviction in its favour; but still more by the treatment which it receives from opponents. When we hear that a Minister makes a point of reserving his opinion on the subject, as Mr. Labouchere did to the deputation on partnership, you understand that the principle has advanced to be nothing worse than a matter of doubt even with the Executive! The modes in which we might apply this principle without waiting for a total change of society are, the removal of penal restrictions on labour, facilities for the establishment of working partnerships, central facilities for the exchange of information on all the great branches of employments,—especially the agricultural statistics, which Mr. Milner Gibson has been so long demanding—and the establishment of a sound law in lieu of the Poor Law, giving the opportunity of labour to every able-bodied man who needs it. These I have mentioned as the specific measures by which the principle might be applied without delay. The last would afford that stage upon which the industrious classes might effect their transfer from one employment to another; a process which economists talk of as following improvements in machinery, but one which has hitherto been somewhat imaginary.

Believing that measures so much more important to the body of the People, than to classes which already monopolize the prosperity of the country, will not originate with class legislators, I join with those who demand an extension of the parliamentary suffrage to the whole body of the nation. The fears with which that measure has been viewed have abated in a more striking degree than the expectancy with which the claimants view it. I believe, indeed, that it will have none but a very general effect on the choice of legislators or the course of legislation; but it will afford to the acting statesmen of the day the sole means of learning the wishes of the nation, and of obtaining for their measures the sanction of the nation.

Some of these points I shall further illustrate in future letters, for materials are continually growing to our hands. Meanwhile, those friends who are doubting will better understand my general drift for this explanation.

Yours, most sincerely,  
THORNTON HUNT.

## Literature.

Critics are not the legislators, but the judges and police of literature. They do not make laws—they interpret and try to enforce them.—*Edinburgh Review*.

THE death of Dr. LINGARD is a national loss. As a candid, impartial, and comprehensive historian, he bequeaths to his country a work, the labour of long years, which may be pronounced the standard *History of England* up to that point from which MACAULAY starts. The strict fairness and undeviating fidelity with which the task is accomplished without the sacrifice of a conviction, the mild and tolerant principles, the large and varied learning at once discursive and profound, the lucid and ample style, render Dr. LINGARD's *History* an honour to his country and to his Church, and an enduring monument to his own fame. It is accepted by all creeds, opinions, and parties, with equal respect and admiration. The unruffled calm of this good man's long and unostentatious life, the disregard of noisy celebrity, the deep love of retirement, the simplicity of life and manners which distinguished his character, are as delightful as they are instructive to recall; for they evidence the temperate nature, the mild and patient spirit, the open and chastened heart, which are the very ideal of a Christian, and the only true signification of a Catholic. That Dr. LINGARD should have been able, even in times of bitterness and intolerance, to maintain and assert his own convictions without forfeiting the esteem of his controversial adversaries, that his death should now be mourned as a national bereavement, and a full voice of sympathy and honour swell around his grave, is a high and signal proof that it is not so much diversity of opinions as harshness of imputation that rends men asunder: that truth need never fear discussion: that it is only the perverse ingenuity of systems that can distort and thwart generous and upright natures, which, left to their own development, bring forth fruits of loving-kindness.

Doctor LINGARD had happily lived far removed from the atmosphere of the Papal Court; and so he died, as he lived, an English Catholic. May we not, Englishmen of all Churches or of none, lay aside our differences for a moment at least, as we stand at the grave of a brother of whose memory we are proud? May we not condescend to a little less of theology and a little more of charity and forbearance.

In another part of our columns will be found a letter from the friend and physician of Dr. LINGARD, replying, unnecessarily we think, but with a natural indignation, to an ignoble report of we know not what obscure paper. The beloved historian had long endured a painful malady with the unswerving fortitude of a philosopher and a Christian, and he breathed his last in perfect happiness and trustful peace.

The latest edition of the *History of England*, and we believe the fifth, was published in 1849, by DOLMAN, and is in ten volumes.

The *History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, had been almost rewritten by him.

The last work from the venerable doctor's pen was a republication at his suggestion of a treatise originally written some years ago, entitled *Documents to ascertain the Sentiments of British Catholics in former Ages, respecting the Power of the Popes*. This was issued de circonstance last winter, with a preface by his friend, the Reverend M. A. TIERNEY, the historian of Arundel.

We have received a circular of a new weekly Catholic journal, "under ecclesiastical sanction," which "will promote the great cause of Free Trade, Parliamentary Reform, and Social Progress, as embodied in the views of the *Irish Brigade*, the Manchester School, and the Peel party—the only liberal sections now remaining in the House of Commons."

We hail this announcement as a gratifying phe-

nomenon. A "Catholic" journal, "under ecclesiastical sanction," "conducted in a broad and comprehensive spirit." This may do for Catholicism in England; but how will it suit the infallible authorities at Rome? How will it agree with the *Congregation of the Index*? How will the College of the Propaganda and the conclave of Cardinals approve of this organ of "Parliamentary Reform and Social Progress." There is one saving clause, however, which announces that "the theological department has been placed under the direction of a distinguished Doctor of Divinity, who will guard its doctrinal statements from error, and impart to its teachings the voice of authority." A special correspondent at Rome, "capable of interesting the English world in the affairs of the Eternal City"—and, we presume, in the blessings of Papal government—is a prominent feature in the prospectus. We hail all converts to "Social progress"—but from so unexpected a quarter!

EUGENE PELLETAN, all of whose writings that we have seen do honour to French literature, and whose name is conspicuous in the powerful phalanx of *La Presse*, is now writing a series of delightful papers in the feuilleton of that journal, which he calls *Profession de Foi du Dix-neuvième Siècle*. For vigour of thought, purity, and elegance, united to an epigrammatic concision of style and brilliant imagery, these papers, which are a kind of *Story of the Progress of Humanity* through successive civilizations, are eminently noticeable, and well worthy of his name; which, to our mind, is the highest praise.

P. J. PROUDHON has just issued a new pamphlet, with the following significant title:—*Idee Générale de la Révolution au IXme. Siècle*. The main purpose of the treatise is an analysis of the great industrial forces of actual society, and the inevitable absorption of the political by an economical régime.

A new and revised edition of the much-lamented FREDERICK BASTIAT's *Harmonies Economiques* has just appeared, with his last additions. They contain the entire rationale of Free-trade.

EDGAR QUINET has come out upon the "Revision" question with a pamphlet, in which he exposes and annihilates the Bonapartist and anti-Republican factions.

PIERRE VINCARD, an engraver on precious stones by trade, who was president of the delegated workmen under LOUIS BLANC's commission at the Luxembourg, has written on the *Ouvriers de Paris*, a series of papers first published, we believe in the *Bien-être Universel*, and now in a collected form. He is at present, we are informed, in London, on a visit to the Exposition.

EMILE SOUVESTRE's name appears as the editor of the *Confessions d'un Ouvrier*. From a glance at these confessions we trace the influence of GEORGE SAND's *Compagnon du Tour de France*.

M. MOREAU CHRISTOPHE has just completed the third and last volume of his, *Solution du Problème de la Misère*. The last volume treats of pauperism in modern times.

Here is another great gun of the "Party of Order." M. GAUTIER, an intimate friend of LOUIS PHILIPPE, formerly a deputy of the Gironde and peer of France, is very prosy and important on the topic—"De l'Ordre: des Causes qui le troublent et des Moyens de le rétablir." For l'ordre read la Monarchie in this and all similar titles from the same party, and then ask *La quelle*? These tedious chapters of the *Bordeaux Vignicole*, are written in the true spirit of *La Gironde*: the department which in the reactionary fury of 1848 and its disgust for republican institutions, actually hesitated between offering allegiance to the Queen of England or forming a federal state under the dictatorship of Marshal BUGEAUD.

The *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government*, by Mr. GLADSTONE, are noticed in other parts of our columns. We hope they will draw forth an universal voice of hearty English execration on the authors of atrocities like those Victor Hugo was called unnatural for imagining in a drama of which the scene was Padua, in the 16th century, under the Government of Venice! Mr. GLADSTONE has made a valuable contribution to the political literature of the day.

#### MR. GLADSTONE'S LETTERS.

*Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen, on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government.* By the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone, M.P. for the University of Oxford. Second Edition. Murray, Albemarle-street.

LETTERS so remarkable as these have not issued from the press for many a day; nor has a fact so remarkable as that which they convey to the public, happened for a long time. The Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone, a scholar, a man of academic reputation, an eminent member of the Conservative party of English politicians, and distinguished among members of that party for his calm and logical mind, and for his profound views of the nature and functions of a Church—this man goes to Italy in the winter of 1850-51, and spends three or four months at Naples. He has heard before of the cruel political prosecutions that have been going on in Naples since the suppression of the reform movement in Italy; but now that he is on the spot he comes to know such horrors, such facts of unparalleled atrocity, connected with the judicial proceedings of the Neapolitan Government, that he cannot, as a man and a Christian, keep silence; but, quitting Naples, resolves that he will first try what he can privately do to redress the wrongs whose existence he has ascertained, and then, if private exertions fail, denounce these wrongs in the face of the world. Accordingly, in April, 1851, or immediately after his return to England, he addresses a private letter to Lord Aberdeen on the subject, trusting that, through a man of such weight, something may be done. This failing, after three or four months, he publishes the letter, and appeals to that public opinion, whose tribunal, he says, he would have shunned, had it been possible to do so. He then appends a second or supplementary letter; and the two are now published together in a united pamphlet. We can but give an extract or two, to which we prefix headings; but we earnestly advise every one to procure and read the whole.

#### NUMBER OF POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES.

"The general belief is, that the prisoners for political offences in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, are between fifteen, or twenty, and thirty thousand. The Government withholds all means of accurate information, and accordingly there can be no certainty on the point. I have, however, found that this belief is shared by persons the most intelligent, considerate, and well-informed. It is also supported by what is known of the astonishing crowds confined in particular prisons; and especially by what is accurately known in particular provincial localities, as to the numbers of individuals missing from among the community. I have heard these numbers for example at Reggio, and at Salerno; and from an effort to estimate them in reference to population, I do believe that twenty thousand is no unreasonable estimate. In Naples alone, some hundreds are at this moment under indictment capitally; and when I quitted it, a trial was expected to come on immediately (called that of the fifteenth of May), in which the number charged was between four and five hundred; including (though this is a digression) at least one or more persons of high station, whose opinions would in this country be considered more conservative than your own (Lord Aberdeen's)."

#### HALF A PARLIAMENT PUT INTO PRISON.

"Shortly after I reached Naples I heard a man of eminent station accused, with much vituperation, of having stated that nearly all those who had formed the 'Opposition' in the Chamber of Deputies under the Constitution, were in prison or in exile. I frankly own my impression was, that a statement apparently so monstrous and incredible deserved the reprobation it was then receiving. It was (I think) in November last. The Chamber had been elected by the people under a Constitution freely and spontaneously given by the King: elected twice over, and with little change, but that little in favour of the Opposition. No one of the body, I think, had then been brought to trial (although I may state, in passing, one of them had been assassinated by a priest named Peluso, well known in the streets of Naples when I was there, never questioned for the act, and said to receive a pension from the Government). So that I put down

the statement as a fiction, and the circulation of it as, at the very least, a gross indiscretion or more. What was my astonishment when I saw a list in detail which too fully proved its truth; nay, which in the most essential point proved more? It appears, my dear Lord, that the full complement of the Chamber of Deputies was 164; elected by constituency which brought to poll about 117,000 votes. Of these about 140 was the greatest number that came to Naples to exercise the functions of the Chamber. An absolute majority of this number, or seventy-six, besides some others who had been deprived of offices, had either been arrested or had gone into exile. So that after the regular formation of a popular representative Chamber, and its suppression in the teeth of the law, the Government of Naples has consummated its audacity by putting into prison, or driving into banishment for the sake of escaping prison, an actual majority of the representatives of the people."

#### CASE OF CARLO POERIO; FORGED EVIDENCE.

"Perhaps, I cannot do better than to furnish a thread to my statement by dealing particularly with the case of Carlo Poerio. It has every recommendation for the purpose. His father was a distinguished lawyer. He is himself a refined and accomplished gentleman, a copious and eloquent speaker, a respected and blameless character. I have had the means of ascertaining in some degree his political position. He is strictly a Constitutionalist; and while I refrain from examining into the shameful chapter of Neapolitan history which that word might open, I must beg you to remember that its strict meaning there is just the same as here, that it signifies a person opposed in heart to all violent measures from whatever quarter, and having for its political creed the maintenance of the monarchy on its legal basis, by legal means, and with all the civilizing improvements of laws and establishments which may tend to the welfare and happiness of the community. His pattern is England, rather than America or France. I have never heard him charged with error in politics, other than such as can generally be alleged with truth against the most high-minded and loyal, the most intelligent and constitutional, of our own statesmen. I must say, after a pretty full examination of his case, that the condemnation of such a man for treason is a proceeding just as much conformable to the laws of truth, justice, decency, and fair play, and to the common sense of the community, in fact just as great and gross an outrage on them all, as would be a like condemnation in this country of any of our best-known public men, Lord John Russell, or Lord Lansdowne, or Sir James Graham, or yourself. Carlo Poerio was one of the Ministers of the Crown under the Constitution, and had also one of the most prominent positions in the Neapolitan Parliament. He was, as regarded the Sicilian question, friendly to the maintenance of the unity of the kingdom. He was also friendly to the war of independence, as it was termed; but I have never heard that he manifested greater zeal in that matter than the King of Naples; it is a question, of course, wholly irrespective of what we have now to consider. Poerio appeared to enjoy the King's full confidence; his resignation, when offered, was at first declined, and his advice asked even after its acceptance. The history of his arrest, as detailed by himself, in his address of February 8, 1850, to his judges, deserves attention. The evening before it (July 18, 1849), a letter was left at his house by a person unknown, conceived in these terms:—'Fly; and fly with speed. You are betrayed! the Government is already in possession of your correspondence with the Marquis Dragonetti.—From one who loves you much.' Had he fled, it would have been proof of guilt, ample for those of whom we are now speaking. But he was aware of this, and did not fly. Moreover, no such correspondence existed. On the 19th, about four in the afternoon, two persons, presenting themselves at his door under a false title, obtained entry, and announced to him that he was arrested in virtue of a verbal order of Peccheneda, the prefect of police. He protested in vain: the house was ransacked: he was carried into solitary confinement. He demanded to be examined, and to know the cause of his arrest within twenty-four hours, according to law, but in vain. So early, however, as on the sixth day, he was brought before the Commissary Maddaloni; and a letter, with the seal unbroken, was put into his hands. It was addressed to him, and he was told that it had come under cover to a friend of the Marquis Dragonetti, but that the cover had been opened in mistake by an officer of the police, who happened to have the same name, though a different surname, and who, on perceiving what was within, handed both to the authorities. Poerio was desired to open it, and did open it in the presence of the commissary. Thus far, nothing could be more elaborate and careful than the arrangement of the proceeding. But mark the sequel. The matter of the letter of course was highly treasonable; it announced an invasion by Garibaldi, fixed a conference with Mazzini, and referred to a correspondence with Lord Palmerston, whose name was miserably mangled, who promised to aid a proximate revolution. 'I perceived at once,' says Poerio, 'that the handwriting of Dragonetti was vilely imitated,

and I said so, remarking that the internal evidence of sheer forgery was higher than any amount of material proof whatever.' Dragonetti was one of the most accomplished of Italians; whereas this letter was full of blunders, both of grammar and of spelling. It is scarcely worth while to notice other absurdities; such as the signature of name, surname, and title in full, and the transmission of such a letter by the ordinary post of Naples. Poerio had among his papers certain genuine letters of Dragonetti's; they were produced and compared with this; and the forgery stood confessed. Upon the detection of this monstrous iniquity, what steps were taken by the Government to avenge not Poerio, but public justice? None whatever: the papers were simply laid aside.

"I have taken this detail from Poerio himself, in his defence; but all Naples knows the story, and knows it with disgust.

"Poerio's papers furnished no matter of accusation. 'It was thus necessary to forge again; or rather perhaps to act upon forgeries which had been prepared, but which were at first deemed inferior to the Dragonetti letter.

"A person named Jervolino, a disappointed applicant for some low office, had been selected for the work both of espionage and of perjury; and Poerio was now accused, under information from him, of being among the chiefs of a republican sect, denominated the *Unità Italiana*, and of an intention to murder the King. He demanded to be confronted with his accuser. He had long before known, and named Jervolino to his friends, as having falsely denounced him to the Government; but the authorities refused to confront them; the name was not even told him; he went from one prison to another; he was confined, as he alleges, in places fit for filthy brutes rather than men; he was cut off from the sight of friends; even his mother, his sole remaining near relation in the country, was not permitted to see him for two months together. Thus he passed some seven or eight months in total ignorance of any evidence against him, or of those who gave it. During that interval Signor Antonio de' Duchi di Santo Vito came to him, and told him the Government knew all; but that if he would confess, his life would be spared. He demanded of his judges on his trial that Santo Vito should be examined as to this statement: of course it was not done. But more than this. Signer Peccheneda himself, the director of the police, and holding the station of a Cabinet Minister to the King, went repeatedly to the prison, summoned divers prisoners, and with flagrant illegality examined them himself, without witnesses and without record. One of these was Carafa. By one deposition of this Carafa, who was a man of noble family, it was declared, that Peccheneda himself assured him his matter should be very easily arranged, if he would only testify to Poerio's acquaintance with certain revolutionary handbills. It could not be; and the Cabinet Minister took leave of Carafa with the words—'Very well, Sir; you wish to destroy yourself; I leave you to your fate.' Such was the conduct of Peccheneda, as Poerio did not fear to state it before his judges. I must add, that I have heard upon indubitable authority of other proceedings of that Minister of the King of Naples, which fully support the credibility of the charge."

#### TREATMENT OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.

"Each man wears a strong leather girth round him above the hips. To this are secured the upper ends of two chains. One chain of four long and heavy links descends to a kind of double ring fixed round the ankle. The second chain consists of eight links, each of the same weight and length with the four, and this unites the two prisoners together, so that they can stand about six feet apart. Neither of these chains is ever undone, day or night. The dress of common felons, which, as well as the felon's cap, was there worn by the late Cabinet Minister of King Ferdinand of Naples, is composed of a rough and coarse red jacket, with trousers of the same material—very like the cloth made in this country from what is called devil's dust; the trousers are nearly black in colour. On his head he had a small cap which makes up the suit; it is of the same material. The trousers button all the way up, that the may be removed at night without disturbing the chains. The weight of these chains, I understand, is about eight rotoli, or between sixteen and seventeen English pounds for the shorter one, which must be doubled when we give each prisoner his half of the longer one. The prisoners had a heavy limping movement, much as if one leg had been shorter than the other. But the refinement of suffering in this case arises from the circumstance that here we have men of education and high feeling chained incessantly together. For no purpose are these chains undone; the meaning of these last words must be well considered; they are to be taken strictly."

#### TORTURE IN A NEAPOLITAN PRISON.

"Settembrini, in a sphere by some degrees narrower, but with a character quite as pure and fair, was tried with Poerio and forty more, and was capitally convicted in February, though through an humane provision of the law the sentence was not



executed; but he has, I fear, been reserved for a fate much harder: double irons for life, upon a remote and sea-girt rock: nay, there may even be reason to fear that he is directly subjected to physical torture. The mode of it, which was specified to me upon respectable, though not certain, authority, was the thrusting of sharp instruments under the fingernails."

Read these statements—these statements of a man of undoubted veracity and accuracy—ye men that sit at home at ease, and talk of paternal government and the violence of revolutionary firebrands; and read also the language in which Mr. Gladstone, Conservative as he is—nay, just because he is a Conservative, and would teach the Conservative party how to gain new virtue in this age—expresses his sentiment regarding such facts. His language is so strong that that of Radical Revolutionists themselves is insipid in comparison—"hellish," "debased," "degraded," "prostitution of the judicial office," these are the phrases he uses throughout. All honour to this bold and just Conservative! Let England not forget these letters of his when she comes to judge and select her statesmen.

## RECENT NOVELS.

*Percy Hamilton*; or, *The Adventures of a Westminster Boy*. By Lord William Lennox. 3 vols. Shoberl.

*Castle Deloraine*; or, *The Ruined Peer*. By Maria Priscilla Smith. 3 vols. Bentley.

*The Cup and the Lip*. By Laura Jewry, author of the "Forest and the Fortress," "The Ransom," &c. 3 vols. Newby.

AMONG British manufactures that of the three-volume novel holds a recognized place. If we look at literature with any seriousness, a feeling of scorn rises within us at the products of this branch of industry; but in languid or lazy hours, when the brain is inactive and criticism in abeyance, a more tolerant feeling predominates, and we look on novels as on moral muslins—manufactured for a "season," and that season brief. For it is with novels as with muslins: no one asks, Will they wear?—every one asks, Are they new? A novel three months old is like last year's pattern—an insult to the female mind! With so ephemeral an existence, one must not hope for an organization higher than that of an ephemeron: all that we can ask for is, a brilliancy that shall amuse a while—grateful if we can get that.

We mark a distinction here of primary importance. There are novels which a delighted public crowns as among the finest productions of literature; there are novels lower in the scale than these, and yet so bright with wit, humour, imagination—so thoughtful and so wise—so playful and observant—that the vague hope of an encountering one makes us wade through many of the "season." Both classes are open to criticism, because both are serious. With the "season novels," however, the case is different. You do not criticize muslin patterns—you simply say that you like or do not like them. It is a matter of fancy—of *goût*. Mary Jane likes "loud"—resonant—patterns; Eliza prefers something "quiet." James likes a novel with "plenty of incident;" Robert inclines to moonlight and sentiment. *De gustibus!*

Out of several novels we select three, not with any view of elaborate criticism, but to indicate in passing where the general weakness of novel manufacture lies, and to hint the kind of amusement these works are likely to afford.

Lord William Lennox has less of the necessary craft than his two fair rivals on our list—is by no means equal to them in powers of novel-writing,—but he has an immense advantage, viz., substantial reality. You feel throughout that he is dealing with actual experience. The *Westminster Boy* is taken from the ranks of Westminster School, not from the circulating library. The substance of the book is autobiographical no less than its form. It is not set forth with sufficient art to make a very vivid or enduring impression—indeed, the author's object seems to have been mainly the reproduction of youthful experiences, in such a shape as would please the readers of the *Sporting Review* (where it first appeared); and this rattling sketch of the "adventures" of a young man early in the present century, may serve its purpose. The audience addressed is not a sentimental audience; and all lovers of the romantic and passionate are here duly warned off. Hence, perhaps, the loose slang style, overburdened with scraps of theatrical quotation, which in a literary work would deserve severe reproof. What we especially call attention to is the fact, that Lord William owes his success to the simple but rare process of giving actual experience, in lieu of borrowing from the lumber of three-volume commonplaces.

And here it is that Miss Smith fails. Her *Castle Deloraine* is evidence of considerable talent in the writer, but she is trying to extract food out of thousandfold beaten chaff. Her characters have no existence—not even a fantastic life. They belong to the old repertory of *characteristics*, and have no new features whereby we can for a moment believe in them. Yet the writing—as mere writing—is often good; the dialogues, although very unlikeliest, have sometimes power of thought and power of expression to make them readable, in spite of their being so inartistically dragged in as "fine talk;" and the comments betray an independent tone of mind. The story is as unpleasant as it is improbable; and we, as Socialists, are by no means flattered by the portrait of her Socialist hero, whom we take to be an unmitigated scoundrel. He is handsome and accomplished, as a novel hero should be; he is the son also of a Peer "in difficulties," as novel heroes constantly are; he falls in love at first sight, with a penniless girl, in the approved fashion; marries her secretly, after the example of ten thousand models; passes a romantic honeymoon; is roused from his "dream of bliss" by the announcement of impending poverty, and to save himself and his father (more himself than his father) from this poverty, he takes advantage of the secrecy of his marriage to throw off his young wife, and marries an heiress. The first wife drowns herself in despair; the second, hearing of his conduct, quits him in disgust; overwhelmed by remorse, he (of course) has a fever—they all do—and turns penitent during convalescence; nay, more than penitent, he turns philanthropist, socialist, emigrant! As a hero, we repudiate him—in spite of his beautiful whiskers. But we have little doubt that there are readers who will fall in love with him, and weep scalding tears over the drowned forsaken One (with a big O), and over the remorseful husband. Now of what avail is criticism against tears? If Mary Jane believes in these woes, looks upon the wicked Captain Thornton as a dear delightful creature, and has thorough faith in the reality of this tale, what can we say? Simply, that she likes her muslins of a more gigantic pattern than we do!

Miss Jewry, we have reserved your *Cup and the Lip* to the last, for it is a *bonne bouche*. Your novel amused us, and we think it will amuse the vast majority of readers, not because it amused us, for we know ourselves to be indifferent measures of public taste in such matters, but because it has in it certain elements which are sure of being appreciated: abundance of incident, nice perception of character, geniality and pathos. To one so adroit in the management of interest we would whisper a bit of advice for future consideration: Your tale wants *breadth and unity*; it is rather a succession of episodes than the development of a story; and although each of these episodes keeps interest alive, yet the general effect is frittered away by them. Aunt Katie is a delightful character, and Richard Kerr is subtly drawn—and as a necessary consequence, they usurp the interest meant to surround Dolores and Walter. This is a fault in construction which is serious in its effects. Having hinted so much to the authoress, we may tell the reader that without claiming any lofty merits, the *Cup and the Lip* is considerably above the average; and although not escaping from the region of the circulating library, the authoress has nevertheless observed life sufficiently to mark the old characters with a seal of her own. As a pleasant book, cleverly written, it deserves to be read even after it is three months old.

## LIEBIG'S CHEMICAL LETTERS.

*Familiar Letters on Chemistry, in its Relations to Physiology, Dietetics, Agriculture, Commerce, and Political Economy.* By Justus von Liebig. Third edition, revised and much enlarged. Taylor, Walton, and Maberly.

## (Second Notice.)

At the close of our former paper we left chemistry in its first applications to medicine in the hands of Paracelsus: we had no space to quote with comment this passage, wherein Liebig has a fling at homœopathy:—

"When we represent distinctly to ourselves the utter contempt with which modern medicine looks down on the views of Paracelsus and his followers, regarding their views, like the ideas of the alchemists concerning transmutation of metals, as a hallucination, and compassionating them accordingly, and when we compare with these views the present theories of the causes of diseases, and of the method of cure; the philosopher, with all his pride in the achievements of the intellect in the regions of truth, is humbled by the daily occurrence of contradictions,

which we should hold impossible, if they did not actually exist. For even now the system of Galen and Paracelsus rules, as it did formerly, over the minds of most physicians; and many views remain unchanged, except in the forms of expression. The *archæus* of the sixteenth century was transformed, in the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, into the vital force of the philosophers; and it lives on to the present day in the guise of the all-determining nervous force or influence. No one can deceive himself as to the true position of theoretical medicine who remembers that in our age, in which the true principles of investigation appear to shed abroad their light, clear and brilliant, like the sun, a doctrine was able to develop itself in medical science, which to our posterity will appear incredible.

"Who can maintain that the majority of well-informed and cultivated men of our time stand on a higher level in regard to knowledge of Nature and her powers than the iatro-chemists of the sixteenth century, when he knows that hundreds of physicians, trained in our universities, regard as true, principles which defy alike all experience and sound common sense; that there are men who believe that the effects of medicines are due to certain forces or qualities, which, by means of grinding and shaking can be set in motion and increased in force, and thus communicated to inert bodies; who believe that a law of nature, to which no exception is known, is false for medicines, since they admit that their efficacy may be increased with their dilution and with the diminution of active matter? Truly, one is tempted to adopt the opinion that, among the sciences which have for their object a knowledge of nature and of her forces, medicine, as an inductive science, occupies the lowest place."

And first we would beg permission to express our astonishment at a man of Liebig's eminence writing such a *betrayal* as that closing sentence. Is it possible that he has reflected so little upon the hierarchy of the sciences that he is only "tempted to adopt the opinion" (and that, too, by what he regards as an extravagance!) that medicine occupies the lowest place as an inductive science? or are we, thanks to Auguste Comte, so thoroughly penetrated with the principles upon which the hierarchy of the sciences is founded, that it seems like the vulgarist truism to say that the phenomena considered by medicine, being of greater complexity than those of other inductive sciences, medicine must in the very nature of things be less advanced than those sciences upon which it depends?

Leaving that point, however (by no means trivial, since it lets one into the secret of his philosophy), let us ask how Liebig can speak thus arrogantly of homœopathy when the capital result of chemical philosophy at the present day points to an issue something of this kind: all the varied phenomena of chemistry are simply variations in the arrangement of molecules:—

"Light, heat, the vital force, the electric and magnetic forces, the power of gravity, manifest themselves as forces of motion and of resistance, and as such change the direction and vary the strength of the chemical force; they are capable of elevating this force, of diminishing or even of annihilating it.

"Mere mechanical motion suffices to impart a definite direction to the cohesive attraction of crystallizing substances, and to modify the force of affinity in chemical combinations. We may lower the temperature of water, when completely at rest, far below the freezing-point, without causing it to crystallize. When in this state, the mere touch with a needle's point suffices to convert the whole mass into ice in a moment. In order to form crystals, the smallest particles of bodies must be in a state of motion; they must change their place or position, to be able to arrange themselves in the direction of their most powerful attraction. Many hot, saturated saline solutions deposit no crystals on cooling, when completely at rest; the smallest particle of dust, or a grain of sand, thrown into the solution suffices to induce crystallization. The motion once imparted propagates itself. The atom to which motion has just been communicated imparts the same impulse to the next, and in this way the motion spreads throughout all the atoms of the mass."

That the trituration and dilution of medicines should develop new forces and produce new effects seems monstrous to Liebig, who is nevertheless perfectly aware of the fact that difference of effect is constantly produced by inconceivably trifling causes—who knows that the faintest friction causes fulminating mercury to explode—that the mere touch with a feather suffices to decompose the ammoniacal oxide of silver or the iodide of nitrogen. "The mere putting the atoms into motion in these instances alters the direction of the chemical attraction. Owing to the motion imparted the atoms arrange themselves into new groups. Their elements aggregate anew, forming

new products." If this be so, what is there unreasonable in the supposition that trituration may develop new forces in the medicines? Our stupendous ignorance of chemical action—especially of organic chemistry—renders it imperative on us to be cautious ere we front a fact with any denial derived from our philosophy. The homeopathist proclaims his fact; examine if it be true, if the fact be so; but do not reject it because monstrous in academic eyes. Our readers know that we have given no pledge to homeopathy: we only desire that it may be treated with the same respect as other tentatives to get at a solution of the mystery. Our purpose in commenting on Liebig's assault was, however, ulterior in its aim. We wished to exemplify how, from the want of real philosophy, a man could sneer at an opinion which his scientific experience tended to support. In Chemistry he was familiar enough with the importance attributable to mere change of position; but in Medicine he stuck to the old routine, and laughed at the idea of trituration and dilution producing any new effects!

But enough of controversy! Liebig's work is not controversial, and we but ill convey an idea of it by touching on these points. It is substantially what the title imports—a Familiar Exposition of Chemistry, setting forth with very great clearness all the leading principles accepted by men of science, and illustrating them with abundance of detail, much of it very curious, and drawn from the most recent discoveries. The book is too compact to admit of analysis in any space that we could afford it; but to the passages already quoted we shall add two, as samples of his exposition:—

KOSMOS.

"Until very recently it was supposed that the physical qualities of bodies,—i. e., hardness, colour, density, transparency, &c., must depend upon the nature of their elements or upon their composition. No one could imagine to himself one and the same body in two different states, and it was tacitly received as a principle that two bodies containing the same elements in the same proportion must of necessity possess the same properties. How could it be possible, otherwise, for the most ingenious philosophers to regard chemical combination as an interpenetration of the particles of different kinds of matter, and matter as susceptible of infinite division? There never was a greater error. If matter were infinitely divisible in this sense, its particles must be impermeable, and billions of such molecules could not weigh more than an infinitely small one. But even the particles of that impermeable matter, which, striking upon the retina, produce that sensation which, when it has reached the inner consciousness, is recognized as light, are not, in a mathematical sense, infinitely small.

"Inter-penetration of elements in the production of a chemical compound supposes two distinct bodies, A and B, to occupy one and the same space at the same time. If this were so, different properties could not consist with identity of composition.

"That hypothesis, however, has shared the fate of all the views of natural phenomena entertained by the philosophers of past times. It has fallen, like them, without any one taking the trouble to maintain it. The force of truth, dependent upon observation, is irresistible. A great many substances have been discovered amongst organic bodies, composed of the same elements in the same relative proportions, and yet exhibiting physical and chemical properties perfectly distinct one from another. To such substances the term *Isomeric* (from *isos*, equal, and *meros*, part) is applied. A great class of bodies, known as the volatile oils—oil of turpentine, essence of lemons, oil of balsam of copaiba, oil of rosemary, oil of juniper, and many others, differing widely from each other in their odour, in their medicinal effects, in their boiling point, in their specific gravity, &c., contain the same elements, carbon and hydrogen, in the same proportions. No one of them contains more of either element than the others do.

"How admirably simple does the chemistry of organic nature present itself to us from this point of view! An extraordinary variety of the most remarkable compound bodies is produced with equal weights of two elements—and how wide their dissimilarity! The crystallized part of the oil of roses, the delicious fragrance of which is so well known, a solid at ordinary temperatures, although readily volatile, is a compound body, containing exactly the same elements and in the same proportions as the gas we employ for lighting our streets; and, in short, the same elements, in the same relative quantities, are found in a dozen other compounds, all differing essentially in their physical and chemical properties.

"These remarkable truths, so highly important in their applications, were not received and admitted as sufficiently established, without sufficient proofs. Many examples have long been known where the analysis of two different bodies gave the same composition; but such cases were isolated observations,

homeless in the realms of science; until, at length, examples were discovered of two or more bodies whose absolute identity of composition, with totally distinct properties, could be demonstrated in a more obvious and conclusive manner than by mere analysis; that is, they can be converted and reconverted into each other without addition and without subtraction.

"In cyanuric acid, hydrated cyanic acid, and cyanamide, we have three such isomeric compounds.

"Cyanuric acid is crystalline, soluble in water, and capable of forming salts with metallic oxides.

"Hydrated cyanic acid is a volatile and highly corrosive fluid, which cannot be brought into contact with water without being instantaneously decomposed.

"Cyanamide is a white substance very like porcelain, absolutely insoluble in water.

"Now, if we place the first, cyanuric acid, in a vessel hermetically sealed, and apply a high degree of heat, it is converted by that influence into hydrated cyanic acid; and then, if this is kept for some time at the common temperature, it passes into cyanamide, no constituent being separated, nor any body taken up from without. And again, inversely, cyanamide can be converted into cyanuric acid and hydrated cyanic acid.

"We have three other bodies which pass through similar changes, in aldehyde, metaldehyde, and elaldehyde; and again two, in urea and cyanate of ammonia. Further, 100 parts of aldehyde, hydrated butyric acid, and acetic ether, contain the same elements in the same proportion. Thus one substance may be converted into another without the separation of any of its elements, and without the introduction of any foreign body.

"The doctrine that matter is not infinitely divisible, but, on the contrary, consists of atoms incapable of further division, alone furnishes us with a satisfactory explanation of these phenomena. In chemical combinations, the ultimate atoms of bodies do not penetrate each other, they are only arranged side by side in a certain order, and the properties of the compound depend entirely upon this order. If they are made to change their place—their mode of arrangement—by an impulse from without, they combine again in a different manner, and another compound is formed with totally different properties. We may suppose that one atom combines with one atom of another element to form a compound atom, while in other bodies two and two, four and four, eight and eight are united; so that in all such compounds the amount per cent. of the elements is absolutely equal; and yet their physical and chemical properties must be totally different, the constitution of each atom being peculiar, in one body consisting of two, in another of four, in a third of eight, and in a fourth of sixteen ample atoms."

#### PHYSIOLOGY AND CHEMISTRY.

"Through Nature herself, who is a whole, the natural sciences stand in a necessary mutual connection, so that no one of them can entirely dispense with all the others for its development. The extension of the individual branches of science by researches, has the inevitable result, that in a certain stage, or at a certain period, two of them, for example, come into contact at their boundaries. As a general rule, a new science arises on the debatable land between them, which combines in itself the objects and the modes of viewing the phenomena of both. In order to this interpenetration, both must have reached a certain advanced stage; the independence of the original territories must be secured, for till this be done, the energies of the philosopher will not be applied to the border province. In these days we look forward to such a fusion of physiology with chemistry, as to one of the most striking results of scientific investigation. Physiology has attained a point at which it can no longer dispense with chemistry in striving after its object, namely, the study of the vital phenomena in their natural succession. Chemistry, the duty of which is to show in what degree the vital properties depend on chemical forces, has been prepared, and is now ready, to take up new departments of science, to be independently studied.

"The phenomena presented by animals during their life are among the most complicated natural appearances; and the detection of their different causes, and the ascertaining the precise share of each in the result, is a task of peculiar difficulty.

"It is a rule in natural science to divide every difficulty which is to be examined, into as many parts as possible, and to study each of these separately. According to this rule, all physiological phenomena may be divided into two classes, of which each, up to a certain point, may be studied quite independently of the other. Such a separation, it is obvious, is not found in Nature, where both classes of phenomena are mutually dependent, so that, indeed, they mutually determine each other.

"The processes of impregnation, development, and growth in animals, the mutual relations of their organs, and the agencies peculiar to these,—the laws of their motion, and of that of the fluids of the body—the anatomical and other peculiarities of nervous and of muscular fibres; all these striking and inter-

esting phenomena may be ascertained without regard to the nature of the substances which form the parts in which these properties reside. But physiology has to do with other phenomena, not less important. Digestion, sanguification, nutrition, respiration, and secretion depend on a change of form and quality of the substances introduced from without into the system, or on certain solid or liquid constituents of the organism; and it is in the study of these processes, as far as they can be regarded apart from structure, that chemistry must come to the aid of physiology. It is evident that physiology has two foundations, and that by the fusion of physiological physics, the foundation of which is anatomy, with physiological chemistry, which rests on animal chemistry, a new science must arise, a true physiology, which will stand in the same relation to the physiology of the present day, as modern chemistry does to that of the eighteenth century.

"In order to form a just idea of the interpenetration of physiology and chemistry, we must call to mind similar occurrences in the history of science. Thus the character of modern chemistry has been essentially determined by the circumstance that it has absorbed into itself entire branches of physics, which now no longer belong to that science. The density of bodies in the gaseous state, forty years ago, was regarded as a purely physical character; but since we have learned that this property depends on the composition in a fixed relation, the study of this property belongs to chemistry. Similar relations have been discovered between the specific heat, the boiling point, and the crystalline form of bodies, on the one hand, and their composition on the other; and it is now chemistry which especially occupies itself with the exact determination of these properties. The doctrine of electricity, so far as it is the result of a change in form and quality, of a chemical change, has now almost entirely passed into the domain of chemistry.

"Exactly in the same way, the more accurate knowledge of vital phenomena will establish the conviction that a number of physiological properties depend on chemical composition; and physiology, when it shall have taken up animal chemistry, as a part of itself, will possess the means of investigating this relation of dependence; it will then be enabled to find a juster expression for physiological phenomena.

"Men have often tried to explain vital phenomena exclusively on chemical principles, and to make physiology a part of chemistry. This was done centuries ago, at a time when the chemical changes in the body were better known than the organism itself. But when men had learned to know the admirable structure, the form and quality of the organs, and their combined action by a more exact study of anatomy, they imagined that they had found the key in certain principles of mechanics. All such attempts have entirely failed; and their failure gave rise to physiology as an independent science. Mineralogy was in a similar relation to chemistry; forty years ago, many considered it a part of chemistry, and compound minerals were classed with the salts. Mineralogy conquered her independence, not by rejecting the doctrines of chemistry, but by taking into her own domain the determination of the composition of minerals. Since mineral analysis has become a part of mineralogy, it is from mineralogists that we have obtained, and daily obtain, the most valuable results in regard to the relation which exists between the chemical composition of minerals and their crystalline form and other physical properties."

#### BOOKS ON OUR TABLE.

The Great Exhibition Prize Essay. By the Reverend J. C. Whish, M.A. Longman and Co.

The Reverend W. Emerton, of Hanwell, having offered a prize of £105 for the best essay on "The Respect in which the Exhibition was calculated to further the Moral and Religious Welfare of Mankind and the Glory of God," it was ultimately awarded to the Reverend Mr. Whish. The performance is a sort of sermon, marked by much feeble good nature. The author's point of view being the pulpit, he delineates chiefly the spiritual aspect of the question; but had he also taken the workshop and the cottage, as his points of view, the object of the Reverend donor might have been more efficiently answered.

Key to the Great Exhibition, 1851. By E. Heine. Ackermann and Co.

The plan is clever and interesting, the sheet representing in its lines and colours the various divisions of the Crystal Palace. The avenues are represented by a white ground, the compartments by a green, and the galleries by a pink shading. A list of the chief objects of interest is also printed in each compartment, so that at a glance the visitor may discover his way through the building, and to its chief points of attraction. It will soon appear in several languages.

Miss Martineau and her Master. By J. Stevenson Bushnan, M.D. John Churchill.

The tone of this work is so extremely objectionable—so unbecoming the gravity of philosophic discussion and the courtesies of literature—that we cannot suffer it to pass without calling Dr. Bushnan



"to order." As a refutation it is characterized by a readiness in the use of metaphysical commonplaces turned against the atheistic positions, but it does not strike home. Our own differences with Mr. Atkinson and Miss Martineau are—as the readers of the *Leader* know—both numerous and essential; but it is one thing to differ from these writers, and another to agree with Dr. Bushman!

The Law as to the Exemption of Scientific and Literary Societies from Parish and other Local Rates, &c. By George Tayler, Esq., of the Inner Temple. Crockford, Essex-street.

This small volume is intended as well for the general as for the professional reader; so that secretaries and managers, or committee-men, of the societies to which it refers, may understand it. Mr. Tayler has admirably succeeded in his two-fold object of rendering the book useful to the lawyer, and intelligible to the general reader. On the one hand, the former has everything that he can desire, namely, the statutes creating the exemption, 6 and 7 Vict. c. 36, complete; a digest of all the cases which have been decided on the construction of that statute, and a verbatim report of the two recent and very important cases relating to the Royal Manchester Institution and the Manchester Concert Hall; on the other, the latter will find practical directions to enable societies to claim the exemption from rateability, forms of every kind, together with remarks on the policy of the statute. Many of the societies are deprived of the privilege of exemption in consequence of their letting their hall or theatre for public meetings and other purposes; but the following remarks by Mr. Tayler on this point, may be well worthy of the attention of the managers and members of such societies:—

"A still more important point (which has not yet been publicly mooted), is whether a society may not occupy, within the statute, a part of its premises, and therefore be entitled to a partial exemption. As the letting is very frequently only of the lecture hall or theatre, this point may, in some cases, be well worth testing. It is clear that such societies are not entitled wholly to exemption; but the statute does not seem to prevent their claiming and having the exemption as to all the remainder of their premises. Perhaps the Court will be inclined to hold that the exemption is, as it were, personal to the society, and that, therefore, it must be wholly exempt, or liable, for all the property. The language of the statute does not make such a construction necessary; and if a partial exemption were allowed, it would benefit to that extent many societies now wholly excluded." (P. 27.)

In a note, p. 44, the writer says:—

"I would suggest to Mechanics' Institutes, and such institutions, not as a lawyer, but as a friend, the importance of a class, or classes, for the study of history. Our working-classes are commonly greatly deficient in this respect, as compared with their other knowledge; and, indeed, in the education of all classes perhaps too little attention is paid to history. Among the working classes, however, there are large numbers of men who are keen and clever controversialists in morals, politics, metaphysics, and theology, if they are not far seeing and profound, and many of them have read extensively on these subjects; but I fear that it is rarely that an intimate knowledge of history can be found among them; and this is the more to be regretted, as it is the element that is most wanting to complete their knowledge and their ability on the subjects I have mentioned; for to erect a sound education of these, history is an ever requisite measuring-rod, if it is not the great plumb line; and in political speculation it is the only chart."

With these remarks we entirely concur; for, as Cicero has it, "Not to know what has been transacted in former times is to continue always a child." If no use is made of the labours of past ages, the world must remain always in the infancy of knowledge.

The Expositor,

A weekly recorder of inventions, designs, and art-manufactures, is a repository also of art-illustrations, combining every object of public and present interest in its chosen department. The parts in which it is issued periodically, are elegant and attractive in a high degree. It is, indeed, an adaptation of scientific and manufacturing literature to the drawing-room table.

The Cup and the Lip. By Laura Jewry.

Newby.

Reformatory for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes, and for Juvenile Offenders. By Mary Carpenter.

C. Gilpin.

A World-embracing Faith; or, Religious Whispers from the Exhibition of Industry. E. T. Whitfield.

How to See the Exhibition in Four Visits. By W. Blanchard Jenold.

Bradbury and Evans.

RELIGIOUS FEELING.—If parents were really as anxious that their children should love God, as that they should love themselves, they would use the same means for exciting this love; they would not so much enforce it as a duty that He should be loved and thanked, as lead the child to do so of his own accord; they would endeavour that He should be associated in their minds with every idea of cheerfulness and enjoyment, and thus lay the foundation for a pure, rational, and efficient religious principle, the only source of permanent happiness.—*Education of the Feelings*, by Charles Bray.

## Portfolio.

We should do our utmost to encourage the Beautiful, for the Useful encourages itself.—GOSWELL.

### EXTRAORDINARY OCCURRENCE AT A RECENT BAL MASQUE.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM AN EMINENT GERMAN TO A FRIEND AT —.

London, June 22, 1851.

You must not publish in the paper of our native town what I am going to relate, as it would ill repay the hospitality which I have received, in consideration less, perhaps, of my own scientific reputation, than of my diplomatic position, and of my father, whom I find to be very popular in England.

None of the journals mention the event;—which I must confess interested me more than anything I have encountered in the world of science assembled here in London.

It would take a more artistic pen than mine to describe to you the brilliancy of those great saloons, or the general splendour of the company. So far as I am a judge, the costume was well revived,—that is to say, the dress; the moral costume, the manner and spirit, I thought to be less perfectly renewed. The assumption of a costume in such a festival challenges a certain expectation of dramatic harmony which did not result. Although the English have had some good actors on the stage—at least so I have heard my father say, but I am not happy in my epoch,—in private life these English have less sense of the dramatic than any nation with which I am familiar. They never forget "the realities of life," by which they mean the bills which they have not paid, or the disappointments which they prefer to cause themselves by teaching to all the little faith they feel; or they mean the "respectability" which they are charged to bear on their heads without rest. All the dresses at this ball looked too new: I do believe there was scarcely one person in Charles the Second's own Court who would not have creased his dress more, with laughing, and gesture, and sporting, than the responsible gentlemen of the actual time in England would do in a year.

Still the aspect was very splendid, and there was some gaiety piercing through the responsible desire of each that he should get through his part properly; that is, bear out his character without infringing the general constraint. So there was Buckingham made modest, and Rochester on his good behaviour. I could not see Lady Castlemain or Miss Stewart in the whole place; at least I did not see that any lady put on the outward garb of those celebrated beauties.

If there was some real gaiety, there was, as I could see, some real tragedy. I noticed one young lady to whose eyes I thought that brilliancy and concourse were bitterness and pain; and elsewhere I saw a little hurried incident of a note given to a lady, which was afterwards explained to me by the discoveries of a jealous husband, of a very extraordinary kind. So that the multitude of policemen outside could not altogether prevent some incidents of that revolution which is always going on underneath the smoothest part of society's surface. And amidst all the splendour—where there was that flood of living colour and of gold, which the flood of light made ten times more gorgeous—that field of precious stones ever sparkling in the light to a perpetual motion—I could notice that the conversation often recurred to "business." "Bus'ness, bus'ness," truly says Puckler Muskau, is the word ever in an Englishman's mouth. It is the Englishman's Bottle Imp.

"I am told, wherever I go," said the Count de Grammont, a gentleman with an exceedingly solemn and business-like countenance, "that trade is very bad; getting worse every day."

"So I hear," replied Chiffinch, with the true Exeter-hall twang and relish of a calamity.

"But, perhaps," interposed Rochester, with an air of anxiety, "this entertainment, so admirably planned for the purpose, may have a beneficial influence on the market."

"And yet, I don't know," rejoined Chiffinch, "how the freak of a night can redeem for Bethnal-green, or for any other of our dangerous districts, the mistakes of a century. A court ball is 'good for trade' undoubtedly; but I fear it will take something more"—he paused; De Grammont and Rochester answered him in silence, with faces of settled despondency.

Before Chiffinch could resume his didactics, their attention, as well as mine, was drawn to the middle of the vast saloon, on which a silence fell, so dead and sudden, that it smote the ear with a sense of some unusual event. By a common consent we moved towards the spot, through the gay and splendid throng, which seemed to be at once drawn by curiosity in the same direction, and yet to shrink back with a shuddering haste; and by the time we had gained our places, a wide circle was formed in the suddenly deserted centre.

A strange spectacle was that! Around was that

gay and splendid throng, packed like a mob gathered to see the Queen, yet driven back by awe, even as the common people are by dragons; only this mob was arrayed in every tint of velvet and silk—regal purple, flame colour, blue of the brightest sky, through which rose shoulders bright as angels; a mob, all over glittering with precious stones, silent, breathless with amazement, and pale; so silent that you could hear the murmur of the lamp-flames amid the thousand lustres above.

And in the midst of that circle was a pile so huddled, dim, and unwonted, that the eye could not at first disentangle it. At last you could see that it was a group of human beings. On the ground, half kneeling, crouched a woman, pale and emaciated, who, from her naked bosom, was sucking that which might be taken for a bundle of rags. The man, short and yet slender, stood by her; in clothes so faded that you could scarcely define what they were: that which once was waistcoat had paled to the unnamed dusty tint to which his linen had darkened. Half behind and half between them, leaning on the mother's shoulder, on the father's hand and arm, were two children, of various ages; one more sat behind its mother, and leaned against her, overcome in a headache of feeble sleep. Hungry they all looked, and squalid; not eager, but rather slow and helpless; hopeless, submissive, almost indifferent. Not a word escaped them. The woman's eyes were bent down, or raised at intervals towards the bystanders, with an alien look. The man looked constantly onwards. The children alone moved an eye of confessed suffering to the world around; but cold, without expectation or appeal. Scarcely would you have thought that group human.

Why are they suffered to remain? Who will stir to drive them forth? Whence come they? How got in? How suffered in that atmosphere of luxury and splendour, of brilliancy and perfume? What ghostly jest, what hideous masking is this?

Alas! it is no masking. Paha! What is that hideous consciousness which spreads abroad—that acrid, heavy, loathsome, appalling stench? It is—do you not know it?—it is the stench which squalid humanity drags forth with itself from its squalid home!

Suddenly, but with a slow suddenness, the woman rises; the group gathers itself up for its journey, and passes on. They have gone!

A sigh of relief bursts from the bystanders.

"How did it come there?" murmured an indignant gentleman, looking around, but not pursuing the phantom to its unknown whither.

"I had no idea it was so close till you warned me," whispered a lovely lady, beautiful and splendid, bright and pale. She shuddered. "It touched me!"

"It touched you!" exclaimed Chiffinch, and he chuckled inwardly but harshly: "How do you know that it did not make that very brocade you are wearing?"

Next day the windows of another great house, but not so great, were veiled with the blinds. Lady Julia was dead: some said of fright, some of cholera.

## The Arts.

ANGELO.

If you have not seen Rachel's *La Tisbe*, you have yet to divine the full scope of her incomparable powers, in one of the most supple and sensitive of her creations. You have yet to learn the broad and various range of art, over which she flings, with the disdain of a sorceress, the magic and the mastery of a genius, perhaps the most intense and delicate, sparkling and subtle, profound and passionate, the theatre has ever known. You have seen her clothe with light and warmth the colder and austerer grandeurs of the classical tragedy, and you have been disposed to forego that M. Eugène Scribe was *De l'Académie Française* when the dexterous mediocrities of that most skilful and à propos of playwrights assumed a colour and a feeling, and a fancy, at the touch of the Enchanter's wand.

But from M. Eugène Scribe to Victor Hugo, believe me, the ascent is steep and perilous: from the flaccid and pert prose, the petty artifices, the bourgeois sentimentalities, the jack-in-the-box situations and small surprises of the clever and ingenious *faisleur* to the Titan of the romantic drama, inflexible of will, implacable of purpose, reckless of phrase, vast in conception, rough-hewn in vigour of design, sculptural in embodiment. Mark the difference! that *here* the artist must rise to the height of the great argument; there the meagre, the sketchy, the trivial must be filled up, recreated, informed, sustained by the actor's art. All the efforts that the imagination of the genius that creates has imposed upon Art that interprets, in one case by the exigency of strength

are exhausted, in the other by the exigencies of weakness. Now, it was not pleasant to me to find our burly critics who are for ever belauding the said M. E. Scribe as the first of dramatists for inexhaustible invention, neatness, felicity, falling foul of Victor Hugo as if he were the merest dauber of melodramatic horrors, and belabouring him with the stereotyped charges of unnatural and impossible personages, violent and shocking situations; and treating the secret passages, masked corridors, flying panels, and mysterious keys, as so many wilful accumulations of a child-like love of terror, for terror's sake. Such were the commonest objections raised when the play was first performed in Paris, and to which Victor Hugo replied over and over again from the text book of contemporary history. Another vulgar objection was the simplicity of the language; the inexplicable fault of making human beings translate their feelings into ordinary human expressions! It is this realism which to me constitutes the essential power of Victor Hugo's dramas. You may object to it as to a form of Art; but once granted the form, it is impossible to reject the energy, the vitality of the treatment. But what more mortal offence can you inflict upon the critics of our day than boldness, originality, power? What sin so unpardonable as to sin against mediocrity and commonplace? To fill the high places of the stage, to be applauded enthusiastically by France and England; and even to be relished by northern barbarians, is, after all, no slender merit. Not a little tact, dexterity, and address are necessary to write numberless vaudevilles, libretti for the Opéra Comique and the Grand Opéra, five act serious and sentimental comedies; and to furnish a répertoire for every theatre in Europe. M. Scribe has these incontestable titles to fame, and we like him all the better for his sincere mediocrity; it consoles the envious and the disappointed; and as to the wit, the secret of our applause is, that we catch it so readily that we enjoy it as if it were ours—it seems so pleasantly familiar. Scribe for ever! says the age of the Bourgeoisie. I am not ashamed to confess admiration of Victor Hugo's dramas: the grasp of conception in his characters, the energy in conducting a complicated action, the strong individualizing faculty, the deep local colour of his historic aspects, the wide sweep of emotions from the most tender to the most terrible, the flesh-and-blood reality of the personages, with their crimes, sorrows, passions hurrying them on to tremendous issues, are to me almost unique. Think of the subjects of his dramas—*Hernani*, *Lucrezia Borgia*, *Ruy Blas*, *Marion de Lorme*, *Marie Tudor*, *Angelo*! In each and all you trace the masterly hand of a student, a philosophic thinker, an earnest worker. He is not writing for the noisy success of a few nights in a heated playhouse, but as the creator of a new drama—troubled, violent, hurried, abrupt as life itself; epitomizing all the sorrows, the diseases, the problems, the aspirations of our restless civilization. Victor Hugo writes like a man hewing out untrodden paths to fame; and with the fearless ardour of genius, carving for himself a niche of undisputed glory in the temple of his country's literature. I can well understand the tempest of persecution which assailed the young enthusiast: the jealousies, the intrigues, the prejudices, the animosities which beset his first successes. The lawsuits in which every successive play involved him, were not so much the result of political censure as of paltry theatrical coteries and literary intrigues. For his dramas were a revolution in art; and though we may be far from approving the school he created, we must not confound the careless and coarse copyists with the great original of their servile and unintelligent idolatry. Victor Hugo will ever be the favourite dramatist of the French People; for they detest what is tame and colourless, and take refuge in deep and grand emotions from the petty incidents and cares of common life. But I hasten to speak of *Angelo*. Set in a framework of that fearful Venetian despotism, with the spy, the secret panel, the poison, the rack, the executioner, for ministers of a vengeance ever watchful and a suspicion never sated, we find types of humanity, true to all time and circumstance. Here are two women, the one, the woman "of the world," the other a courtesan, rejected by and rejecting society. Woman, the victim of social laws and conventional lies, with all her virtues and imperfections, ever self-sacrificing, often deceived, never wholly corrupt. The one asserts the strength and the purity of an unsullied heart, the other is redeemed through tears and suffering, and we bless her in her death

for having loved much. The rancour of a woman's jealousy is forgotten in the pious memory of filial affection; the passion is subdued by duty; the lover makes place for the mother; hatred is absorbed in devotion. Side by side with these two women are the despot husband and the proscribed lover; and what a picture is presented of the tyranny of social concealments, of the irregular relations to which they give birth, and of the eternal struggle of the heart and the world! And then, in the sombre and shadowy background of the picture, ever stands the instrument of vengeance, the fatal witness: the type of the envious, the discontented, the disinherited of this world's riches and pleasures, varying in shape according to time and place, but always, and in all places, gnashing his teeth at joys to which he is a stranger, at prosperities which he can never reach, at passions which he shares unsatisfied! The doors that love opens for the fortunate revenge unlocks for this miserable wretch; and there he stands, a restless minister of Evil Fortune, and his death is the death of a dog. To this picture a court placed half-way between royalty and the life of the citizen lends a skilfully proportioned dignity; the domestic element of the story adds the charm of truth. To all these elements of interest, more or less permanent or social, the historical is added; and thus the strong local colour of a century, a people, a civilization, deepens and darkens the incidental and individual features of the story. Such is this drama of *Angelo*, as the poet himself interpreted its purpose, and, as I think, impartial criticism discovers.

Now, in what words can I hope to give you a faint idea of Rachel as *La Tisbe*, the brilliant courtesan, the rival, with words of fire upon her lips and the poison at her heart, purified by the memory of a mother's love, forgiving, self-sacrificing, patient of taunts and injuries, and at last redeemed from all stains by suffering, and triumphant in Love over Death? Perfection is the only word adequate to describe Rachel's delineation! From the exquisite petulance of her earlier scenes with the imbecile and doating tyrant, and the thrilling tenderness of her love passages with the man who does not love in return, to the poignant self-abandonment of the last scene (broken only by fitful gleams of passion), where confessing the misery of life without love, and having completed her moral expiation by restoring her rival to her lover's arms, she accepts death as a beneficent boon from the man who has trifled with her heart, rejected, insulted, murdered her, and expires with a sigh of blessing. If I could express on paper all the subtle lights and shadows of tender grace, the bitter and the biting irony, the profound and penetrating passion, the struggle of hatred and gratitude, the calm, resolved heroism of duty and affection, the unspeakable pathos of the last voluntary humiliation, often expressed by the nicest inflections of voice, the finest subtleties of tone, look, gesture: all belonging only to the last refinements of the delicatest art inspired by the most abundant genius—even then I should give you but the faintest and most meagre impression of Rachel's *La Tisbe*.

How do you think, for example, she says to Angelo?—

"Si vous croyez que vous êtes beau quand vous me regardez comme cela."

Or to Rodolpho:—

"Je reviens seulement pour te dire un mot: Je t'aime! Maintenant je m'en vais."

Or to Angelo again, when she wheedles him out of the key:—

"Ah! c'est une clef. Tiens, je ne m'en serais jamais doutée. Ah! oui, je vois, c'est avec ceci qu'on ouvre. Ah! c'est une clef."

Or to her rival:—

"Ah! tenez, ne niez pas. Il était là! Et que vous disiez vous? Mille choses tendres, n'est ce pas? Ah! ne me touchez pas, Madame!"

To Rodolpho again, in the final scene:—

"O Rodolpho, c'est donc bien vrai: dites le moi de votre bouche, vous ne m'avez donc jamais aimé?"

Rodolpho—"Jamais!"

*La Tisbe*—"Eh bien! c'est ce mot là qui me tue, malheureux!"

Ah! my dear Sir (a country cousin, I presume), it was, perhaps, fortunate for you that you were wholly in the dark as to what was being said and done, and who was "that dark young woman they applaud so much," or you never could have enjoyed such perfect peace of mind, or maintained so calm a countenance the whole evening!

Rachel's sister, Rebecca, was a very charming Catarina—gentle, pathetic, natural. Her freshness of manner and voice lent life and truth to every scene where she appeared. But neither Rebecca nor any other of the family whom the genius of Rachel has introduced to the stage, give a sign of that power and intensity which belongs to genius alone; for genius is not hereditary nor collaterally distributed. The sisterly devotion of Rachel is a gem in her crown.

*Angelo* was, on the whole, more carefully, intelligently, and effectively performed than any produced at the St. James's this season. M. Jouanni deserves a special word for the way in which he had "composed" the sombre and sinister features of Homodei, the chief of the sbirria, and the part was altogether most characteristically rendered.

#### THE OPERA.

I went, as a matter of duty, to "assist at," as our neighbours so characteristically say, the first performance of Auber's last, I dare not say his new opera. It was far from being, I can assure you, a musical "solemnity"—unless "solemnity" and "dulness" be synonymous. The criticisms I had met in the Parisian press had not conspired to predispose me very keenly in favour of *Zerline; ou, la Corbeille d'Oranges*—a title fruitful of mystery and sufficiently vague, and at the same time homely and familiar to please many tastes. "Blessed is he (I have somewhere read) who expects nothing, for he shall not be disappointed." Accordingly, I have the pleasure to inform you that I was not disappointed. You cannot expect me to relate the poem of the opera, but I subjoin a specimen of the opening chorus:—

"To enjoy our macaroni

Is the delightful privilege of us lazzaroni."

I have an indistinct recollection of baskets of oranges, of a galley, and of a good deal of lounging and macaroni, and local activity going on "under the direction of Mr. A. Harris"; but as both MM. Scribe and Auber appear to have had but one object in view, viz., to construct a part for Albion, or as a French critic called it, a "cavatina in three acts," I may as well speak of Albion in whom all the libretto, all the music, and all the acting is centred. I should be the last to complain of this delicious singer being the entire opera! All that was wanted was a sort of frame for her marvellous embroideries, her sparkling floods of brilliant notes, shooting up like rockets and descending like a shower of pearls in a perfect luxury of melody. How can you be weary of listening to a voice managed with such marvellous facility, vibrating like a silver bell, fresh and clear as crystal, soft as honey. What power! what method! what perfection! She seems rather to breathe than to sing, so absolutely effortless, so gushing and spontaneous is the melodious utterance. Then the expression of her features so happy and gay, of an almost childlike simplicity and fresh grace is, as her voice, a repose, a luxury, a charm. Yet, notwithstanding the delight of listening to Albion, I never knew any opera go off so flatly. It had not even strength enough to be knocked down: it simply fell. Auber must have composed (or rather collated) the score in extreme haste. But we may do him the justice to say that he only copies from himself. Here a reminiscence of the *Gustave*, there of the *Sirène*; now of the *Lac des Fées*, presently of the *Domino Noir* or the *Ambassadrice*. The music is neither grave nor gay, neither lively nor severe, but has a fatigued and, if I may so say, transplanted air.

Auber has been a fertile composer, but not more fertile than original. He has seldom attempted to conceal deficiency of melody under scientific pretensions; always lively and elegant, charming, if not transporting. But a man who has gained so often honourable laurels, has no right to risk them: the more durable even his fame, the more jealous should he be not to fritter it away; and not to make memory do the work of imagination.

A Chinese dance in the last act was the sole original feature of the opera, and (with considerable difficulty) obtained the only encore of the evening. The accompaniment of the hautbois and piccolo is pleasingly bizarre. The house was filled with "furriners" (as they are called perhaps from the quantity of beard), and country folk. My neighbour asked me, *Who the stout lady might be with the orange basket?* Such is Fame! He was occupied a great part of the evening in counting the number of boxes, and it may be even the people in the pit. The other evening, at the *Flauto Magico*, I know, considerable disappointment was felt at Stigelli with his band of niggers not perform-



ing an Ethiopian melody or two. Stigelli was mistaken for BONES.

The theatres have been filled, I am glad to bear witness, every night this week; and are now beginning to reap their share of the benefits of the Exhibition year. The playbills are an evidence that they do not forget to deserve support. I went a night or two since to take a peep at—

#### GODIVA

at Punch's Theatre. It seemed to suit the taste of the audience, and, therefore, why should I take exception to the puns of *Godiva* which I thought worse than usual (for puns are nothing if not detestable), and to burlesques in general which I cordially hate and abjure. They have done a great and permanent injury to the stage by destroying the illusion on which the glory of the stage rests. This wit of words too, so far removed from the wit of thought, makes me first sick, and then savage. Why should so much capability for better things be wasted on such trash? Mind, I am no stickler for the "legitimate drama" in an exclusive or formalist sense; the true "legitimate drama", to me, is the drama which purifies, instructs, elevates, but not didactically. The drama should at least represent human life, and not be a machine for infusing slang into the English language, and a vehicle for the lowest form of wit. Why are you in so great a hurry, young men, to rob the stage of its illusion? Think of your boyish days, and don't defraud the rising generation of the faith you once enjoyed in that mimic kingdom. All illusions are short-lived enough. Life itself, as it gathers years, is but their funeral pile! A word to the authors of *My Wife's Second Husband*. When so many Frenchmen are present, with but an imperfect knowledge of our language, would it not be kind to tell them that this original farce is a translation of an *Arnalie*, produced some time since at the Variétés, and entitled *Le Second Mari de ma Femme*?

LE CHAT-HUANT.

## Organizations of the People, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.

The Executive Committee of the National Charter Association met on Wednesday evening last. Present—Messrs. Arnott, Hunt, Jones, and Milne. Messrs. Harney and Reynolds, being in the country, were absent, as were also Messrs. Grassby, Holyoake, and O'Connor. Mr. John Milne presided. Ernest Jones reported that he had made arrangements for his tour, and would commence his engagements at Exeter on Monday, August the 4th, by delivering two lectures. From thence he should visit Torquay (two lectures), Devonport, Plymouth, Bristol, Bridgewater, Merthyr Tydvil (two lectures), Llanidloes, Newtown (two lectures), Birmingham, Peterborough, Newport Pagnell, Northampton, Congleton, Stockport, Padham, and Bolton. The friends in other places (who may require his services) are requested forthwith to communicate with him at 72, Queen's-road, Bayswater, London. The Secretary was instructed to state that G. Julian Harney was on a tour in Scotland, and would, ere long, return through the North and Midland counties, the friends who may be desirous of his services are requested to address "G. Julian Harney, Mauchline, Ayrshire, North Britain." And also, as G. J. Holyoake will be at Newcastle-on-Tyne on Sunday, July 27, and expects to remain in that district for two or three weeks, those friends who desire a visit from him are requested to address their communications, "care of Mr. James Watson, bookseller, Green-market, Newcastle-on-Tyne." The matter to be inserted in the forthcoming Monthly Circular was then discussed and arranged, and the Secretary was instructed to give the following extract from the introduction thereto:—

"The object we have in view in issuing this Circular is to promote and extend the organization, that thereby a spirit of emulation may be aroused, and that one locality renews what the others are doing may be stimulated on renewed energy and action. Although we are convinced that it is the worst policy in the world to attempt prematurely to force a movement, yet we feel assured that the materials are arranging themselves for the coming crisis; and, as we are keenly eyeing passing events, we are most desirous of preparing for that time."

The committee then adjourned to Wednesday evening, July 30.—Signed on behalf of the committee, JOHN ANNOTT, General Sec.

CHARTISTS' BOARD.—The secretary was instructed to announce at the last meeting, that the *Monthly Circular* would be printed by the 1st of August; and all localities and friends are specially requested to state as early as possible, by letter addressed to the General Secretary, the number of copies that may be required.

#### HARMONY-HALL PETITION.

[We have been requested to publish the following petition, which we do, however, disagreeing with the spirit in which it is expressed, which, to say the least of it, is not happy, considered as the emanation of Socialists whom we suppose have the honour of that cause at heart. Wherever dissension exists it is better that it should come out and get itself put genial, and on this account we accord the petition insertion. As it stands it, will be read as pointing out the legal advisers mentioned, as the authors of the acts complained of. We cannot enter into a matter of which we are wholly ignorant, but we must say that this mode of expression can only weaken the case of the petitioners. Messrs. Atkinson and Saunders are strangers to us, but we feel bound to say on public grounds, that the character of Mr. Ashurst is so unquestionable that we can only trace the implications in the petition to partisan spirit or misapprehension.]

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled,  
The Petition of the Central Board of the Rational Society, enrolled under 10 George IV. and 4 and 5 William IV.,

Sheweth,—That in 1835, Robert Owen commenced a society for the practical carrying out of his views on cooperation.

That in 1837, the rules for the government of the society were agreed upon at a general meeting of delegates from various parts of the country, signed among others by Robert Owen and John Finch, and copies were sent to J. Tidd Pratt, for enrolment and certificate, and were certified and enrolled accordingly.

That by the said rules the name of the society was declared to be the "National Community Friendly Society."

That at the annual congress of the society, held in 1838, the said rules were revised, and other copies, signed by Robert Owen, John Finch, and William Pare, amongst others, were sent as before for enrolment and certificate, and were certified and enrolled accordingly.

That at the annual congress of the society, held in 1843, it was unanimously agreed, amongst other things, that the name of the society should be "The Rational Society," and the altered rules were enrolled and certified as before.

That after the first enrolment of the society, in 1837, upwards of sixty branches, numbering altogether some thousands of members (principally working-men), were formed in various cities and towns of England and Scotland; namely, amongst others, in London, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Bolton, Stockport, Bristol, Huddersfield, Halifax, Blackburn, Bradford, Leeds, Worcester, Macclesfield, Coventry, Oldham, Bath, Rochdale, Leicester, Ashton, Sheffield, Doncaster, Great Yarmouth, Hull, Wigan, Preston, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Cheltenham, Brighton, Chatham, Sunderland, Darlington, Norwich, Reading, Stourbridge, Northampton, Derby, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Paisley, and Dundee.

That after the said first enrolment the members began to subscribe money to carry out the objects of the society on the faith of its principles, the good character of its leaders, and the perfect legality of all the steps that were taken.

That at the annual congress, held in 1839, the said John Finch, of Liverpool, iron merchant; William Clegg, of Chetham-hill, Manchester, merchant; and Charles Frederic Green, of London, gentleman; were appointed trustees of the society and lessees of an estate at Queenwood, in the county of Hants, which had just then been taken of Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, on behalf of the society, and the sum of £37,794 was raised and afterwards expended upon the said estate.

That at the annual congress of 1840 the draft of a trust deed, prepared by W. H. Ashurst, of Cheapside, London, the society's solicitor, was considered and ordered to be completed forthwith.

That the said John Finch has written many letters and addresses, from time to time, in the *New Moral World*, which was the weekly publication of the society, declaring his utmost confidence in the experiment, and urging the members to come forward liberally with their subscriptions; that besides being lessee and trustee as aforesaid, he has been the president of the society and signed scrip in that capacity; that he has been president of the congress on various occasions, and governor of the community established at Queenwood, as aforesaid; and that he insured the said estate in the names of "John Finch and others, trustees."

That from an official account rendered to the annual congress in 1845, it appeared that the sum of £37,794 had been subscribed and lent by the members, benefit societies, and others, and the property was valued at £25,676, leaving a deficit of £14,239, after deducting £2121, being the amount of liabilities to various tradesmen.

That in consequence of this deficiency it was unanimously agreed, on the 16th of July, 1845, by the congress (the said lessees and trustees concurring) to assign the property to John Buxton, Frederic Bate, and George Bracher, in trust for the benefit of the creditors of the society.

That the said assignees forthwith proceeded to compel the members of the society who were located on the estate, with their families, to leave it, and begin the world again as best they might; that they also proceeded to make arrangements for a sale of the whole estate, which was duly advertised to take place on December 6, 1845; and that the said John Finch then interfered a few days before the sale was to have taken place, and forbade it.

That the said John Finch afterwards requested a special

congress to be called, to consider the best mode of proceeding, which was accordingly done.

That at the said special congress, which was held in April, 1846, the said John Finch attended, and took his seat as an ex-officio member, by virtue of being trustee of the society, as aforesaid; that he also moved and signed resolutions upon which he spoke; and that the congress confirmed the assignment made, as aforesaid, at the previous congress; and, by resolution, requested the said Robert Owen and William Pare to confer with the said lessees and assignees, in order that a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the whole affair might be made.

That in the following month of May, 1846, the said John Finch went down to the said estate of the society, at Queenwood, and at night, along with others, broke into a part of the building, well known throughout the country as Harmony-hall, and took therefrom the official books, papers, documents, agreements, and correspondence belonging to the society, and afterwards boasted that all the members of the society were in his power.

That at the annual congress of the society, held in 1844, the said John Buxton was appointed president of the society and governor of the community, and had possession of the property in that capacity; and that after his appointment as one of the aforesaid assignees, he continued to hold possession, by request of his co-assignees.

That on the 9th of June, 1846, the said John Finch headed a party of agricultural labourers, and forcibly ejected the said John Buxton from the estate, and also forcibly turned his wife and children out upon the highway, where they all encamped for the space of several weeks, until a meeting of creditors and all parties interested had been held, to decide on what was best to be done under the circumstances.

That the said meeting was called for June 29, 1846, and the said John Finch, by public advertisement, forbade the parties to meet upon the said estate, and threatened all who came upon it that they would be liable for trespass; and also stated in the advertisements that it was believed the principal object of calling the meeting was to afford an excuse for parties to congregate together and commit a breach of the peace.

That the meeting was, therefore, held at Rose-hill, a place adjoining the said estate, and the said William Pare attended and moved certain resolutions as and for the said John Finch, which were passed without any opposition by the meeting.

That immediately after the meeting, the said John Buxton left the estate, and it has since been in the possession of the said John Finch, and of one George Edmondson, who now holds it.

That no account whatever has since been rendered to the society, nor any moneys paid over to the members, nor has any statement whatever been made, of what is intended to be done with respect to the said property.

That from correspondence which has been published, it appears that the said John Finch acted, and is acting, under the advice of the said W. H. Ashurst, and of Messrs. Atkinson and Sanders, Manchester, solicitors.

That one of your petitioners received a letter, on May 18, 1846, from the said John Finch, in which he stated his opinion to be that the property of the society was fairly worth from £18,000 to £20,000.

That your petitioners being publicly and prominently connected with the said society have received very many affecting letters at various times, from poor working-men, in almost all parts of the country, urging them to take effectual steps to obtain a settlement of the society's affairs, and to get them the money which they had subscribed, the non-possession of which was entailing cruel hardships upon them.

That your petitioners have called upon the said Robert Owen to interfere and obtain a settlement, but that he refused to do so.

That your petitioners have done all in their power to bring about a settlement by moral means, not being able to see that much real benefit was likely to result by any proceedings at law.

That your petitioners are unable to state whether a trust deed was ever executed or not, inasmuch as the papers and documents of the society were improperly taken out of their possession as aforesaid, and as they are thus debarred from all access to the accounts, they cannot ascertain from a perusal of the bill of the said W. H. Ashurst, any information relative to the execution of the said deed.

That the specious and plausible promises held out to the members to subscribe their hard-earned money in order to benefit their condition, the number of poor members in all parts of the country who were inveigled by those promises, the extent of their subscriptions, the utter non-fulfilment of the promises, or return of any of the money, and the wide-spread calamity which has been the result, are facts which loudly call for the interference of your Honourable House.

That as your Honourable House has ordered an inquiry to be made into the affairs of the National Land Company, from which much good appears likely to result, it is the opinion of your petitioners that a similar result would be effected by an inquiry into the affairs of The Rational Society; and that the circumstances of the case strongly warrant such an inquiry.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable House will forthwith order an inquiry to be made into the affairs of the Rational Society, before a committee of your Honourable House; and that your petitioners, in common with other members thereof, may be heard in support of the allegations herein contained, in order that justice may be done to all parties interested.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

CENTRE OF CO-OPERATIVE AGENCY.—The public will be (or at least ought to be) glad to learn, that the Company established at 76, Charlotte-street,

Fitzroy-square, for the promotion of Coöperation, have now instituted, "Under Trust," a Central Coöperative Agency, "to counteract the system of adulteration and fraud now prevailing in Trade, and to promote the principle of Coöperative Association."

"This agency is founded upon the following principles:—That trade, exchange, distribution of goods, are trusts to be administered alike in the mutual interests of producers and consumers, not to be conducted as matters of speculation. That any adulteration, fraud, falsehood of any kind, in price, quantity, or quality, is a misdemeanour, and should be dealt with as such by public opinion, and by each individual producer or consumer, in the absence of law. That the most legitimate and efficient means which the wealthier classes have for aiding the working-men, and both working-men and the wealthier classes for aiding the poor out of employment, is to secure their consumption to coöperative establishments by giving their orders through a regular channel, acting under an especial responsibility for the purpose. That an equitable and freely accepted arbitration between producers and consumers, and the regulation of demand and supply according to the coöperative principle, should be substituted for the arbitrary and selfish power of private speculation.

"Rules have been framed and printed, to enable any number of families of all classes in any district of London or any part of the country to form themselves into 'friendly societies,' for enjoying the benefit of coöperative stores. To be sent by post to parties forwarding four stamps. Particulars of the nature and objects of the Central Coöperative Agency, with a digest of the deed of settlement, are to be found in the printed report of a meeting held at the central office of the agency. To be sent by post to parties forwarding four stamps. A list of articles with the wholesale prices for coöperative stores, and a detailed catalogue for private customers, will also be sent by post on payment of one stamp for the wholesale list, and two for the catalogue. Particulars, rules, list, and catalogue will be forwarded immediately on receipt of ten stamps."

These objects are of incalculable interest, morally and pecuniarily, to the public, and we hope they will receive that attention which will prove that no company works in vain in this department.

**ECLECTIC INSTITUTE.**—On Monday evening a crowd assembled in the Eclectic Institute, Dean-street, Soho, to consider the awful depopulation of Ireland. The speakers were, Mr. O'Connor, M.P.; Messrs. Rogers, Laurie, O'Brien, Jefferson, Ellis, Bezer. Mr. Anstey, M.P., Messrs. Thornton Hunt, Ernest Jones, G. J. Holyoake, who were invited, were prevented by engagements from being present. A vote of thanks was passed to the editors of the *Leader*, *Northern Star*, *Glasgow Sentinel*, and *Reynolds's Newspaper*, for the gratuitous publicity they had given to the announcement of this meeting. The resolutions were passed unanimously. They were inserted in our last number.

**REDEMPTION SOCIETY.**—We are still earnestly engaged in carrying out the scheme of propagandism agreed to by the late congress. The camp meeting, which was to have been held last Sunday on Woodhouse-moor, Leeds, was prevented on account of the rain. The camp meeting on Skircoat-moor, Halifax, was held, and well attended, although it rained nearly the whole time. The people kept well together. The meeting was addressed by Mr. D. Green, of Leeds, Mr. James Campbell, of Manchester, and several other friends, who received repeated tokens of approbation from the audience.—Mr. Henderson, of Leeds, delivered a lecture in the Christian Brethren's Room, Huddersfield, last Sunday, on the evils which result from competition in trade. At the conclusion of the lecture Mr. Bowker, of Huddersfield, requested permission to speak in opposition, when it was decided by the audience that a regular discussion should take place in the evening. The discussion lasted from half-past six o'clock till after nine, and was conducted in a satisfactory manner, free from all bitterness and abuse. Many new members have been enrolled in consequence of these meetings. Two open air meetings will be held in the neighbourhood of Leeds next Sunday, weather permitting. Mr. Henderson has been spending a short time at the society's estate, and reports that all is going on well. The crops are in excellent condition, and promise an abundant harvest. The members enjoy good health, and live and work together in harmony. Nothing seems wanting but more house accommodation. The prompt completion of the building fund is the one thing needful for our success. We hope the friends of association who are able will assist us in this matter. The following extract of a letter received from the community, since the return of Mr. H., will show the opinion of the located members:—"It is with great pleasure that I sit down to write to you this week, as I believe we are in a more favourable and progressive state than I have ever seen our community since I came into it."—Moneys received for the week:—Leeds, £1 10s. 10d.; Huddersfield, per D. France, £1 2s.; Edinburgh, per J. Renton, 2s.; Halifax, £1 4s. 6d.; Liverpool, per T. Lund, 13s. 5d. Building Fund, Leeds, £1 5s. 6d.; Huddersfield, 1s. 6d.; J. Y., 4s.; Edinburgh, 6d.; Shelton, Staffordshire, 2s. 6d.; Liverpool, 18s. Propagandist Fund, Leeds, 1s. 4d.; Huddersfield, 5s. 8d.—JAMES HENDERSON, Secretary.

**ANTI-TRUCK SOCIETY.**—In reference to the Anti-Truck Society, whose formation at Derby we noticed in a former number, we find that an act has been prepared by that body, to be brought before Parliament next session. It provides that all wages, duly agreed upon, shall be disbursed by the employer to the employed without any deduction on the various shameful pretexts at present in vogue; such as frame and machine rent, money for "standing-room," &c., or for any debt whatsoever, under a penalty of £2 for each such offence. Likewise, that when sub-contractors employ workmen, the owners of the works shall be liable to them for their wages.



## Open Council.

[IN THIS DEPARTMENT, AS ALL OPINIONS, HOWEVER EXTREME, ARE ALLOWED AN EXPRESSION, THE EDITOR NECESSARILY HOLDS HIMSELF RESPONSIBLE FOR NONE.]

There is no learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awakened, and his judgment sharpened. If, then, it be profitable for him to read, why should it not, at least, be tolerable for his adversary to write.—MILTON.

## "MALTHUS AGAIN!"

39, Park-street, July 22, 1851.

SIR,—In the *Leader*, Vol. II., No. 66, page 616, we read, in an article entitled "Malthus Again!"—"That population, if unchecked, would advance as 1, 2, 4, 8, while food would only advance as 1, 2, 3, 4;" the latter a gross blunder, as any one would find out who had an opportunity of observing the multiplying effect of spade husbandry, followed by good manuring and judicious cropping. The real fact is, food by such a system of cultivation would always be in advance of population as 1, 2, 8, 16 is to only 1, 2, 4, 8.

ARTHUR TREVELYAN.

## CANT IN SCOTLAND.

Paisley, July 20, 1851.

SIR,—The walls at the corners of the streets, and in the chief places here, were seen placarded to-day with hand-posters:—

REMEMBER  
THE  
SABBATH DAY  
TO KEEP IT  
HOLY!

But why the parties who put up these placards did so, we cannot, on reasonable grounds, determine. Why they should select this, the least important, and the most Jewish of the commandments in the Decalogue, is not easily comprehended. We are led to suppose that by adopting this commandment in preference to those which forbid crimes against humanity—such as, "Thou shalt not kill;" "Thou shalt not steal;" "Thou shalt not commit adultery"—these pious Sabbatarians suppose murder, theft, and licentiousness less reprehensible than Sunday travelling! Let us advise these pious parties to issue next Sunday a second edition of the placard, thus:—

REMEMBER  
THE SABBATH DAY  
AND SPEND IT NOT IN  
DRUNKENNESS!

But, really, until some other means are given the working-classes in Scotland for enjoyment on Sunday, they must needs indulge in the convenient enjoyment of intoxication. Pious, whisky-loving Scotland! I am, sir, your obedient servant,

AN ON-LOOKER.

By the by, a few Sabbatarians in the management of our coffee-room, the principal news-room in town, contrived lately to get the directors—good easy souls!—to shut the room early on the Sunday evenings, with a view in the long run to close it altogether on that day; but a firm remonstrance from the subscribers indicated damage to the dividends of the company, and brought the directors to their senses. The room was only closed one evening.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Dundee, July 17, 1851.

SIR,—In your edition of last week I noticed, in the columns devoted to Open Council, some passages drawn from Scripture, which Mr. Friend (the writer of the article) thinks are prohibitions of "marriage with a deceased wife's sister;" and I must confess that they appear to me in the same light.

But I think that by referring to Duet. xxv. 5, 6, he will find that an inference in favour of such marriages can easily be drawn. Thus—it is there laid down as a law that, if a man dies without leaving issue, his brother is to marry his (his brother's) wife, and raise up children, &c. Now, I ask, may we not reasonably infer that, if this is to be the case when a husband dies, exactly the opposite is proper if the wife dies; viz., that the husband should marry his deceased wife's sister, &c.?

Although I have taken this view of the subject from the Scriptures, I hold the contrary opinion,

viz., that a law legalizing such marriages would be injurious to society, and may at some future period trouble you with my opinions on this subject. Meantime I remain, yours very respectfully,

A CONSTANT READER.

**SUB-DEALERS IN FLOUR.**—We have received a letter from Mr. Smithurst, of Farnsfield, complaining of the public evil of the existence of "a class of sub-dealers" in flour, who attract purchasers for it by offering it at reduced prices, which they are enabled to do by adulterating the article.

## Commercial Affairs.

### MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

SATURDAY.  
Consols remained at 96½ to 3 for money up to Thursday without variation. The closing prices yesterday were—Consols, 96½ 3 for money.

Bank Stock has fluctuated between 214½ to 216½; and Exchequer Bills from 49s. to 53s. premium.

Foreign Stocks have been dull. The bargains in the official list of yesterday comprised—Brazilian, 90½; Mexican, for account, 30½ and 4; Russian Five per Cents., 114; the Four-and-a-Half per Cents., 100½ and 1; Spanish Five per Cents., for account, 20½; Spanish Three per Cents., for account, 38½; Dutch Two-and-a-Half per Cents., 59½; and the Four per Cent. Certificates, 93.

### BRITISH FUNDS FOR THE PAST WEEK.

(Closing Prices.)

	Satur.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Frid.
Bank Stock	215	216	215	215	214	214
3 per Ct. Red.	97	97	97	97	97	97
3 p. Ct. Con. Ans.	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½
3 p. Ct. An. 1726.	95	95	95	95	95	95
3 p. Ct. Con. Ac.	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½	96½
3 p. Ct. An.	99	99	99	99	99	99
New 5 per Cts.	—	—	—	—	—	—
Long Ans., 1860.	—	—	7½	7½	7½	7½
Ind. St. 104 p. Ct.	263	263	263	263	263	263
Ditto Bonds	62 p	—	—	59 p	61 p	58
Ex. Bills, 10007.	54 p	51 p	50 p	50 p	52 p	49 p
Ditto, 5000.	54 p	51 p	50 p	50 p	52 p	49 p
Ditto, 2000.	54 p	51 p	50 p	50 p	52 p	49 p

### FOREIGN FUNDS.

(Last Official Quotation during the Week ending Friday Evening.)

Austrian 5 per Cents.	—	Mexican 5 per Ct. Acc.	90½
Belgian Bds., 44 p. Ct.	93½	Small	—
Brazilian 5 per Cents.	90½	Neapolitan 5 per Cents.	—
Buenos Ayres 6 p. Cts.	—	Peruvian 4½ per Cents.	—
Chilian 6 per Cents.	104½	Portuguese 5 per Cent.	87½
Danish 5 per Cents.	104½	— 4 per Ct.	31½
Dutch 2½ per Cents.	59½	— Annuities	—
— 4 per Cents.	93	Russian, 1852, 4½ p. Ct.	100½
Ecuador Bonds	—	Span. Actives, 5 p. Ct.	31
French 5 p. Ct. An. at Paris 93.90	—	— Passive	5½
— 3 p. Cts., July 11, 56.30	—	— Deferred	—

### CORN EXCHANGE.

**MARK-LANE, July 25.**—Moderate supplies of Wheat and Flour, and small of Oats and Barley, since Monday. With very little demand, holders of Wheat ask the same prices as on that day. Barley scarce at late rates. Oat trade slow at Monday's prices.

Arrivals from July 18 to July 25.

	English.	Irish.	Foreign.
Wheat	2050	—	8,510
Barley	—	—	180
Oats	470	—	6,850

Flour 2260; sacks, 2670; barrels, 2470.

### GRAIN, Mark-lane, July 25.

Wheat, R. New	40s. to 41s.	Maple	30s. to 32s.
Fine	41	White	25
Old	41	Boilers	26
White	46	Beans, Ticks	26
Fine	43	Old	28
Superior New	43	Indian Corn	28
Rye	34	Oats, Feed	17
Barley	24	Fine	18
Malt	27	Poland	21
Malt, Ord.	48	Fine	23
Fine	50	Potato	20
Peas, Hog.	28	Fine	21

### FLOUR.

Town-made	per sack	37s. to 40s.
Seconds	—	35
Essex and Suffolk, on board ship	—	32
Norfolk and Stockton	—	29
A. & C. team	per barrel	20
Canadian	—	20
Wheaten Bread, 7d. the 4lb. loaf.	—	Households, 5d.

### GENERAL AVERAGE PRICE OF GRAIN.

WEEK ENDING JULY 19.

#### Imperial General Weekly Average.

Wheat	42s. 7d.	Rye	38s. 2d.
Barley	25 6	Beans	31 5
Oats	21 11	Peas	28 6

#### Aggregate Average of the Six Weeks.

Wheat	42s. 0d.	Rye	38s. 6d.
Barley	25 1	Beans	31 6
Oats	21 8	Peas	28 6

### BUTCHERS' MEAT.

NEWGATE AND LEADENHALL.\*

	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	2 4	3 2	2 2	3 5
Mutton	2 8	3 6	3 6	4 10
Lamb	3 4	4 4	2 4	3 8
Veal	2 4	3 8	3 6	3 10
Pork	2 6	3 8	—	—

\* To sink the offal, per 8 lb.



their offices, 122, Leadenhall-street, London, and at Southampton

## MORISON'S VEGETABLE UNIVERSAL MEDICINES, DEPOT, 214, Strand.

of the "British College of Health," having expired on the 25th of March last, Mr. MORISON, Manufacturer of the above-named medicines ("Morison's Pills") from the Recipes of the late "James Morison, the Hygienist."

Mr. Morison is Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, and Licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries, and has devoted many years to the study of medicine by the employment of a judicious selection of Drugs, and attention to their thorough combustion and uniformity of mixture, he ensures certainty of effect with the least possible unpleasantness.

He offers the Pills, thus made by himself, as a perfectly safe and efficient purgative, and recommends them to be taken in those cases of illness where the services of a medical adviser are not felt to be requisite.

Sold with directions, in the usual priced boxes, by all Medicine Vendors.

Foreign Houses dealt with in the most advantageous manner.

DR. CULVERWELL ON NERVOUSNESS, DEBILITY, AND INDIGESTION; also on Urinary Derangements, Constipation, and Hemorrhoids. 1s. each; by post, 1s. 6d.

WHAT TO EAT, DRINK, AND AVOID.

"Abstinentia multi curantur morbi."

A popular exposition of the principal causes (over and careless feeding, &c.) of the above harassing and distressing complaints, with an equally intelligible and popular exposition of how we should live to get rid of them; to which is added diet tables for every meal in the day, and full instructions for the regimen and observance of every hour out of the twenty-four: illustrated by numerous cases.

Vols. 2 and 3, companions to the preceding.

THE ENJOYMENT OF LIFE. I. HOW TO BE HAPPY.

"Jacunde Vivere."

ON URINARY DISORDERS, CONSTIPATION, AND HEMORRHOIDS; their Origin and Removal.

Sherwood, 23, Paternoster-row; Mann, 39, Cornhill; and the Author, 10, Argyl-place, Regent-street: consultation hours, ten to twelve; evenings, seven till nine.

RUPTURES

EFFECTUALLY CURED WITHOUT A TRUSS!

DR. BARKER still continues to supply the afflicted with the celebrated remedy for every variety of single and double Rupture, the efficacy of which, in many thousands of cases, is too well known to need comment. It is applicable alike to male or female of any age, perfectly free from danger, causes no pain, inconvenience, or confinement, and will be sent free by post, with instructions, &c., on receipt of 6s. 6d. in postage stamps or Post-office order, payable at the General Post-office, Address Alfred Barker, M.D., 48, Liverpool-street, King's-cross, London. At home for consultation daily from Ten till five, and Four till Eight (Sunday) excepted. A great number of trusses have been left behind by patients cured, as trophies of the immense success of this remedy, which Dr. B. will be happy to give to any requiring them after a trial of it.

IMPORTANT TESTIMONIAL.—A respected correspondent desires to call the attention of such corresponders as are his fellow-sufferers to an announcement in our advertisement columns, emanating from Dr. Barker:—"Of this gentleman's ability in treating ruptures our correspondent speaks in the highest terms, having availed himself of the same, and thereby tested the superiority of his method of treatment over any other extant, all of which he has tried to no purpose. He feels assured that whoever is so afflicted will find a cure by paying Dr. Barker a visit, his method being, as our correspondent believes, beyond improvement." The above appeared in the "Tablet" of Saturday, September 29, 1849.

HEALTH WHERE 'TIS SOUGHT.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.—Cure of a Case of Weakness and Debility, of Four Years' standing.

Extract of a Letter from Mr. William Smith, of No. 5, Little Thomas-street, Gibson-street, Lambeth, dated Dec. 12, 1849.

"To Professor HOLLOWAY,

"SIR,—I beg to inform you that for nearly five years I hardly knew what it was to have a day's health, suffering from extreme weakness and debility, with constant nervous headaches, giddiness, and sickness of the stomach, together with a great depression of spirits. I used to think that nothing could benefit me, as I had been to many medical men, some of whom, after doing all that was in their power, informed me that they considered that I had some spinal complaint beyond the reach of cure, together with a very disordered state of the stomach and liver, making my case so complicated that nothing could be done for me. One day, being unusually ill and in a dejected state, I saw your Pills advertised, and resolved to give them a trial, more perhaps from curiosity than with a hope of being cured, however I soon found myself better by taking them, and so I went on persevering in their use for six months, when I am happy to say they effected a perfect cure."

"WILLIAM SMITH,

("frequently called EDWARD").

Sold at the Establishment of Professor HOLLOWAY, 414, Strand (near Temple Bar), London, and by most all respectable Druggists and Dealers in Medicine throughout the civilised World, at the following prices—1s. 1d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., 11s. 6s., and 33s. each Box. There is a considerable saving by taking the larger sizes.

N.B.—Directions for the guidance of Patients in every Disorder are affixed to each Box.

DO YOU WANT BEAUTIFUL AND LUXURANT HAIR, WHISKERS, MOUTHACHIOS, EYEBROWS, &c.?

THE Immense Public Patronage bestowed upon

Miss ELLEN GRAHAM'S NIUKRENE is sufficient

evidence of its amazing properties in reproducing the human hair, whether lost by disease or natural decay, preventing the hair falling out, strengthening weak hair, and checking greyness. It is guaranteed to produce whiskers, mouthachios, &c., in three weeks, without fail. It is elegantly scented; and sufficient for three months' use will be sent free, on receipt of twenty-four postage-stamps, by Miss Ellen Graham, 6, Ampton-street, Gray's-inn-road, London. Unlike all other preparations for the Hair, it is free from artificial colouring and filthy greasiness, well known to be so injurious.

"My hair is restored. Thanks to your very valuable Niukrene."—Miss Mane, Kennington. "I tried every compound advertised, and they are all impostions. Your Niukrene has produced the effect beautifully."—Mr. James, St. Alban's.—For the nursery it is invaluable, its balsamic properties being admirably adapted to infants' hair.

LIQUID HAIR DYE.—The only perfect one extant is Miss Graham's. It is a clear liquid, that changes hair in three minutes to any shade, from light auburn to jet black, so natural as to defy detection, does not stain the skin, and is free from any objectionable quality. It needs only to be used once, producing a permanent dye for ever. Persons who have been deceived by useless preparations (dangerous to the hair &c.) will find this Dye perfect, every respect, and that "none but itself can be its parallel." Price 3s. sent free by post for thirty-six postage-stamps, by Miss Graham, 6, Ampton-street, Gray's-inn-road, London.

OLD DR. JACOB TOWNSEND'S

## GENUINE ORIGINAL UNITED STATES' SARSAPARILLA.

In submitting this Sarsaparilla to the People of England, who are influenced by the same motives which dictated its promulgation in America, this Compound Sarsaparilla of Old Dr. Townsend has nothing in common with preparations bearing the name in England or America. Prepared by one of the noblest American Chemists, having the approbation of a great and respectable body of American Physicians and Druggists, universally adopted by the American People, and forming a compound of all the rarest medicinal roots, seeds, plants, and flowers that grow on American soil, it may truly be called the Great and Good American Remedy. Living, as it were, amidst sickness and disease, and studying its multitudinous phases and manifestations in Hospitals, Asylums, and at the bedside of the sick, for more than 40 years, Dr. Townsend was qualified, above all other men, to prepare a medicine which should perform a greater amount of good than any other man now living. When resorted to, it enters the stomach, it digests the food, and enters into the circulation as the nutrient part of our aliment does.

Its first remedial action is upon the blood, and through that upon every part where it is needed. It is in this way that this medicine supplies the blood with constituents which it needs, and removes that which it does not need. In this way it purifies the blood of excess of bile, acids, and alkalies, of pus, of all foreign and noxious matter, and brings it into a healthy condition. In this way it quickens or moderates the circulation, producing coolness, warmth, or perspiration. In this way it is that this medicine is conveyed to the liver, where it allays inflammation, or relieves congestion, removes obstructions, cleanses and heals abscesses, dissolves gummy or thickened bile, and excites healthy secretions. In this way, also, is this medicine connected to the lungs, where it allays inflammation, allays irritation, relieves cough, promotes expectoration, dissolves tubercles, and heals ulcerations. In like manner it acts on the stomach to neutralise acidity, remove flatulence, debility, heartburn, nausea, restore tone, appetite, &c. In the same way it acts upon the kidneys, on the bowels, on the uterus, the ovaria, and all internal organs, and not less effectually on the glanular and lymphatic system, on the joints, on the bones, and the skin.

It is by cleansing, enriching, and purifying the blood that old Dr. Townsend's Sarsaparilla effects so many wonderful cures. Physiological science has demonstrated the truth of what is asserted in Holy Writ, that "the Blood is the Life." Upon this fluid all the tissues of the body depend for their maintenance and repletion. It carries to and maintains vitality in every part by its circulation through the system. It replenishes the wastes of the system, elaborates the food, decomposes the air, and imbues vitality from it; regulates the corporeal temperature, and gives to every solid and fluid its appropriate substance or secretion—earthy and mineral substance, gelatine, marrow, and membrane to the bones—fibrine to the muscles, tendons, and ligaments—nervous matter to the brain and nerves—cells to the lungs—living cells to the various parenchymatous and investing substances to the viscera—coats, coverings, &c., to all the vessels; hair to the head—nails to the fingers and toes; urine to the kidneys; bile to the liver—gastric juice to the stomach; sinovial fluid to the joints—tears to the eyes; saliva to the mouth; moisture to the skin—and every necessary fluid to lubricate the entire framework of the system; to preserve it from friction and inflammation. Now, if the impurities which become corrupt, diseased, and the secreting organs fail to release it of the morbid matter, the whole system feels the shock, and must sooner or later sink under it, unless relieved by the proper remedy. When this virulent matter is thrown to the skin, it shows its disorganising and virulent influence in a multitude of cutaneous diseases, as salt rheum, scald head, erysipelas, white swelling, seetor, ring, measles, smallpox, chicken pox, scurvy, skin diseases, boils, carbuncles, pruritus or itch, eruptions, blotches, excoriations, and itching, burning sores over the face, forehead, and breast. When thrown upon the cords and joints, rheumatism in all its forms are induced; when upon the kidneys, it produces pain, heat, calculi, diabetes, or stranguary, excess or deficiency of urine, with inflammation and other sad disorders of the bladder. When it enters the blood, it destroys the blood, destroys the animal and earthy substances of these tissues, producing necrosis, i.e., decay or ulceration of the bones. When conveyed to the liver, all forms of hepatic or bilious diseases are produced. When to the lungs, it produces pneumonia, catarrh, asthma, tubercles, cough, expectoration, and final consumption. When to the stomach, the effects are inflammation, indigestion, sick headache, vomiting, loss of tone and appetite, and a fainting, sinking sensation, bringing troubles and disorders of the whole system. When it seizes upon the brain, spinal marrow or nervous system, it brings on the tic douloureux, neuralgia, chorea, or St. Vitus' dance, hysteria, palsy, epilepsy, insanity, idiocy, and many other distressing ailments both of body and mind. When to the eyes, ophthalmia; or the ears, otitis; to the throat, bronchitis, croup, &c. Thus all the maladies known to the human system are induced by a corrupt state of the blood. With no general remedy on which implicit reliance can be placed as a purifier of the blood, disease and suffering, and consequent want, stalk unchecked and unsubdued in every land in all the world. If there is arrest of action in any of the viscera, immediately they begin to decay; if any fluid ceases to circulate, or to be changed for fresh, it becomes a mass of corruption, and a malignant enemy to the living fluids and solids. If the blood stagnates it spoils; if the bile does not pass off, and give place to fresh, it rots; if the urine is retained it ruins body and blood. The whole system, every secretion, every function, every fluid depend for their health upon action, circulation, change, giving and receiving—and the moment these cease disease, decay, and death begin.

In thus tracing the causes and manifestations of disease, we see how wonderful and mysterious are the ways of Providence in adapting the relations of cause and effect, of action and reaction, of life and death. All nature abounds with the truth that every active substance has its opposite or corrective. All poisons have their antidotes, and all diseases have their remedies, did we but know them. Upon this principle was Dr. Townsend guided in the discovery of his medicine. Prepared expressly by the old Doctor to act upon the blood, it is calculated to cure a great variety of diseases. Nothing could be better for all diseases of children, as measles, croup, whooping-cough, small, chicken, or knee pox; mumps, quinsy, worms, scarlet fever, colds, costiveness, and fevers of all kinds—and, being pleasant to the taste, it can be no difficulty in getting them to take it. It is the very best and most efficacious medicine to cleanse the blood, liver, stomach, kidneys, and skin. In female and nervous diseases, this great remedy does marvels in regulating the menses, making them natural, relieving pains, cramps, spasms, fainting, and carrying off all those disturbing and debilitating influences which cause the falling of the womb, leucorrhoea, or the white, scalding, obstruction, or frequent inclinations to pass urine, weak nerves, weak stomachs, and debilitated muscles and joints, and enriches the blood, and all the fluids of the body. In coughs, colds, bronchitis, weak or tight chest, palpitation of the heart, and lung consumption, the Old Doctor's Sarsaparilla is without a rival. It is a medicine which has been used by hundreds of thousands and is recommended by numerous of the most respectable physicians to the sick, and as it acts through the blood upon every tissue and fluid of the body; upon every organ, fibre, and nerve; upon every gland and cord, muscle and membrane; upon

all the circulating, digestive, nutritive, and secreting organs—from the head to the feet, from the centre to the skin or the circumference—so it arouses a pure and healthy action throughout the whole economy—cleanses it of morbid matter—strengthens weak organs, throws off burdens and obstructions which load and oppress it, and imparts vitality to every minute part of the whole structure. Its virtue is unsurpassed—its success unequalled—and its praises are echoed from all parts of the land.

POMEROYS, ANDREWS, and CO., Sole Proprietors. Grand Imperial Warehouse, 373, Strand, London (adjoining Exeter-hall).

CAUTION.—Old Dr. Jacob Townsend is now over seventy years of age, and has long been known as the Author and Discoverer of the "Genuine Original Townsend Sarsaparilla." To guard against deception in the purchase of this article, the Portrait, Family Coat of Arms (the emblem of the Lion and the Eagle), and the signature of the Proprietors, will be found on every Label; without these none is genuine. Price—Pints, 4s.; Quarts, 7s. 6d.

HOMEOPATHY.—All the Homeopathic Medicines, in Globules, Tinctures, and Trituration, are prepared with the greatest care and accuracy by JOHN MAWSON, Homeopathic Chemist, 1, Old-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne; and 60, Fawcett-street, Sunderland, from whom they may be obtained, in single tubes, neat pocket cases, and boxes, suitable for families and the profession. "Laurier's" and all other works on Homeopathy, together with cases and tubes sent post-free to all parts of the kingdom. Dispensaries and the profession supplied on liberal terms.

Just published, and may be had free of charge, a small pamphlet on Homeopathy, by J. Silk Buckingham, Esq.

MAWSON'S HOMEOPATHIC COCOA.—This Cocoa-nut, or nib, contains a very large proportion of nutritive matter, consisting of a farinaceous substance, and of a rich and pleasant oil. This oil is esteemed on account of its being less liable than any other oil to rancidity. Homeopathic physicians are united in their recommendation of cocoa as a beverage; and the testimonials from other sources are numerous and of the highest character. It was so highly esteemed by Linnaeus, the chief of Naturalists, that he named it Theobroma—"Food for the Gods."

Dr. Pereira says, "it is a very nourishing beverage, devoid of the ill properties possessed by both tea and coffee."

Dr. Epps, the popular lecturer on Physiology, says—"Mother, while suckling, should never take Coffee; they should suckle on Cocoa. I have the testimony of mothers who have so suckled, and they state that they found, with Cocoa without Beer, they produced quite sufficient milk, and the children suckled with such diet were in better health than those suckled on a previous occasion, when Beer, and Coffee, and Tea formed the liquid part of their diet." The same author adds—"Cocoa is the best of all flavoured drinks. It is highly nutritious."

Dr. Hooper says—"This food is admirably calculated for the sick, and to those who are in health it is a luxury."

Many persons have been turned against the use of Cocoa and Chocolate from having tried the many, and very generally inferior article vended at the grocers' shops under that name. The preparation here offered by JOHN MAWSON contains all the nutritious properties of the nut without any objectionable admixture. It is, therefore, recommended as an agreeable and wholesome substitute for Coffee, to which it is certainly much superior, as it is also to the Cocoa sold as "Flake Cocoa," "Flake Cocoa," &c. It is light, easy of digestion, agreeable, nutritious, and requires little time or trouble in preparing for use.

TESTIMONIAL.—"Having used the Homeopathic Cocoa prepared by Mr. Mawson, I have no hesitation in giving it my fullest recommendation."—Thomas Hayle, M.D.

Sold, Wholesale and Retail, by JOHN MAWSON, Homeopathic Chemist, 4, Hood-street, Newcastle, and 60, Fawcett-street, Sunderland.

AGENTS.—North Shields—Mease and Son, Druggists. Sunderland—Mr. John Hills, grocer, South Shields—Bell and May, Druggists. Penrith—Mr. George Ramsay, Druggist. Stockton—John Dodgson and Co. Druggists. Durham—Scawin and Monk, Druggists. Darlington—Mr. S. Barlow, Druggist. Carlisle—Mr. Harrison, Druggist. Agents wanted!

## PAINS IN THE BACK, GRAVEL, LUMBAGO, RHEUMATISM, GOUT, INDIGESTION, DEBILITY, STRICTURE, &c.—DR. DE ROOS'S COMPOUND RENAL PILLS.

As their name, Renal (or the kidneys), indicates, have in many instances effected a cure when all other means had failed, and are now established by universal consent, as the most safe and efficacious remedy ever discovered for the above dangerous complaints, discharges of any kind, retention of urine, and diseases of the kidneys and urinary organs generally, whether resulting from imprudence or otherwise, and a lingering death. For gout, rheumatism, dropsy, scrofula, loss of hair and teeth, depression of spirits, blushing, incapacity for society, study, or business, giddiness, drowsiness, sleep without refreshment, nervousness, and even insanity itself, when (as is often the case) arising from or combined with urinary diseases, they are unequalled. By their salutary action on acidity of the stomach they correct bile and indigestion, purify and promote the renal secretions, thereby preventing the formation of stone, and establishing for life the healthy functions of all these organs. ONE TRIAL will convince the most prejudiced of their surpassing properties. May be obtained at 1s. 14d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., 11s., and 33s. per box, by all Medicine Vendors in the United Kingdom, or should any difficulty occur, they will be sent free on receipt of the price in postage stamps by Dr. DE ROOS.

IMPORTANT FACTS.

T. Webster, Esq., Seaford, near Melton Mowbray, Jan. 6, 1850. "Having read your advertisement, I felt assured your Renal Pills would be of service to some of my neighbours. I have had twelve boxes, and they have derived great benefit from taking them. I shall continue to recommend them to all my friends."—Wm. Cobb, Ewelme, Oxon: "I have, though but a young man, been a great sufferer from pains and debility resulting from gravel. I have had recourse to several medical men of good standing, but nothing has done me so much good as your pills. I have not been so free from gravel, nor has my health been so good for many years, and all this I owe to your invaluable Pills. Before I began to take them, my system was always out of order."

TO PREVENT FRAUD on the Public by imitations of this excellent Medicine, Her Majesty's Honourable Commissioners of Stamps have directed the name of the Proprietor, in white letters on a red ground, to be engraved on the Government Stamp round each box, without which none is genuine, and to imitate which too closely is felony and transportation.

"THE MEDICAL ADVISER," on all the above diseases, by Dr. De Roos, 168 pages, with coloured descriptive engravings; to be had through all booksellers, price 2s. 6d., or, on receipt of forty postage stamps, will be sent direct from the Author.—N.B. Persons wishing to consult the doctor by letter must send a detail of the symptoms, &c., with the usual fee of 41, by post-office order, payable at the Holborn Office, for which the necessary Medicine and advice will be sent to any part of the world.

Address, WALTER DE ROOS, M.D., 35, Ely-place, Holborn, London, where he may be consulted from 11 to 4 till 8, Sunday excepted, unless by previous arrangement.

N.B.—Should difficulty occur in obtaining the above, enclose the price in postage-stamps to the Establishment.



**DEAFNESS—SINGING in the EARS.**—Extraordinary Cures are effected daily, in cases long since pronounced incurable by the Faculty. Even in cases of total deafness, which have existed a lifetime, a positive cure can be guaranteed without pain or operation, by a newly discovered and infallible mode of treatment, discovered and practised only by Dr. FRANCIS, Physician, Aurist, 40, Liverpool-street, King's Cross, London. Dr. F. has applied this new treatment in the presence of and on several of the most eminent medical men of the day, who have been only astonished at its magical effect. All matters to these distressing complaints should immediately consult Dr. Francis, as none need now despair, however bad their case. Hours of consultation daily from Eleven till Four, and Six till Nine. Country patients, stating their case by letter, will receive the means of cure per post, with such advice and directions as are guaranteed to render failure impossible.

## A NEW MEDICINE.

**FRANKS'S SPECIFIC CAPSULE.**—A form of Medicine at once safe, sure, speedy, and pleasant, especially applicable to urethral morbid secretions, and other ailments for which copaliba and cubeba are commonly administered. Each Capsule containing the Specific is made of the purest Gelatine, which, encased in tinfoil, may be conveniently carried in the pocket, and being both elastic and pleasant to take, affords the greatest facility for repeating the doses without intermission—a desideratum to persons travelling, visiting, or engaged in business, as well as to those who object to fluid medicines, being unobjectionable to the most susceptible stomach.

Prepared only by GEORGE FRANKS, Surgeon, at his Laboratory, 90, Blackfriars-road, London, where they may be had, and of all Medicine Vendors, in boxes, at 2s. 9d. and 4s. 6d. each, or sent free by post at 3s. and 5s. each. Of whom, also, may be had, in bottles, at 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. each.

## FRANKS'S SPECIFIC SOLUTION OF COPAIBA.

## TESTIMONIALS.

From Joseph Henry Green, Esq., F.R.S., President of the Royal College of Surgeons, London; Senior Surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital; and Professor of Surgery in King's College, London. "I have made trial of Mr. Franks's Solution of Copaliba, at St. Thomas's Hospital, in a variety of cases, and the results warrant my stating, that it is an efficacious remedy, and one which does not produce the usual unpleasant effects of Copaliba." (Signed) JOSEPH HENRY GREEN.

"Lincoln's Inn Fields, April 15, 1855." From Bransby Cooper, Esq., F.R.S., one of the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons, London; Senior Surgeon to Guy's Hospital; and Lecturer on Anatomy, &c.

"Mr. Bransby Cooper presents his compliments to Mr. George Franks, and has great pleasure in bearing testimony to the efficacy of his Solution of Copaliba. Mr. Cooper has prescribed the Solution in ten or twelve cases with perfect success." "New-street, April 13, 1855."

"\* These medicines are protected against counterfeits by the Government Stamp—on which is engraved 'GEORGE FRANKS, Blackfriars-road'—being attached to each."

## JUBILEE YEAR OF COCKLE'S PILLS.

1851.

"Truth lives not for a fleeting hour,  
But soons e'en Time's destroying power."

The last fifty years have seen many wonderful changes—social, political, and, indeed, all but universal. The medical world itself, too, has had its revolutions. New drugs and new compounds have been introduced, some of which have experienced but an ephemeral existence, whilst others have been retained as choice and valuable. But through all these eventful changes, COCKLE'S ANTIBILIOUS PILLS, the compound of a qualified practitioner, have continued to rise in public estimation, increasing in sale to the present hour. Prepared only by James Cockle, Surgeon and Apothecary, 18, New Ormond-street, London; and sold by all Medicine Vendors, in boxes, at 1s. 1d. and 2s. 9d.

**OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.**—"THE FAMILY MEDICINE CHEST."—A good family medicine chest, with a prudent use, has saved many a life; and yet we think the idea might be improved upon and reduced to a more simple form. Take some good compound, such as Cockle's Antibilious Pills, and we find that the desired end may be obtained without scales and weights or little mysterious compartments and enchanted bottles with cryptic stoppers. Others might be used; but Cockle's Pills, as tested by many thousands of persons, and found to answer their purpose so well, may be set down as the best.—"COMFORT AND ITS SECURITIES."—There can be no comfort without health, and no health without a well-ordered frame. If one organ becomes impaired an appropriate remedy must be sought, and this is never more true than with reference to the liver. The entire body quickly sympathizes with its complaints, and nature looks for help to aid her in the work of restoration. For this purpose Mr. Cockle's Antibilious Pills are one of the greatest achievements of medical science.—"MORNING POST."—"MEDICAL HOUSEHOLD WORDS."—Every family has its specific; but nothing can be more dangerous than the fallacy that one medicine will cure every disorder. Every drug and every compound has its office—beyond which it becomes mischievous, and to the recognition of this great truth may be attributed the unparalleled success of a medicine which has never, during half a century of its existence, met with disparagement. We allude to Mr. Cockle's Antibilious Pills, which have become one of the household words of the British nation.—"DAILY NEWS."—"COCKLE'S PILLS."—We perceive that this celebrated still is still in litigation. Many attempts have been made to put down the defendant, but none with more effect than those made by Mr. Cockle. If the nuisance is ever to be wholly abated Cockle's Antibilious Pills will do it."—*Bell's Life.*

## ANCHOR ASSURANCE COMPANY.

FOR LIFE, FIRE, AND ANNUITIES.

Life Assurances, adapted to every contingency, may be effected with this Company at premiums most economically rated.

Annuitants are granted by the Company on terms exceedingly favourable to the assured.

Fire Insurances are issued at premiums commensurate with the risk arising from the nature or position of the property.

T. BELL, Secretary and Actuary.

Offices, 67, Cheapside, London; Duce-place, Manchester; Exchange-buildings, Hull; Grey-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

## LONDON ASSURANCE CORPORATION.

Established by Royal Charter, A.D. 1720.

FOR LIFE, FIRE, AND MARINE ASSURANCES.

Head-Office, No. 7, Royal Exchange.

Branch-Office, No. 10, Regent-street.

Actuary—Peter Hardy, Esq., F.R.S.

This Corporation has effected Assurances on Lives for a period of One Hundred and Thirty Years.

The Expenses of managing the Life Department are defrayed by the Corporation, and not taken from the Premium Fund.

Fire Insurances effected at Moderate Rates upon every description of Property.

Marine Insurances at the Current premiums of the day.

JOHN LAURENCE, Secretary.

## METROPOLITAN COUNTIES and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, 27, Regent-street, Waterloo-place, London.

## DIRECTORS.

Samuel Driver, Esq.  
John Griffith Frith, Esq.  
Henry Peter Fuller, Esq.  
John Palk Griffin, Esq.  
Peter Hood, Esq.  
Capt. Hon. G. F. Hotham, R.N.  
Thomas Littledale, Esq.  
Edward Lomax, Esq.  
Samuel Miller, Esq.  
Edward Vansittart Neale, Esq.  
Sir Thomas N. Beeve.  
William Studley, Esq.

Life Assurances, Annuities, and Endowments. Three-fourths of profits divided amongst the assured.—Prospectuses, post free, on application.  
F. FERGUSON CAMERON, Manager.

## TRAFALGAR LIFE ASSURANCE ASSOCIATION.

Every description of Life Assurance business transacted. Loans granted on personal and other securities.

Detailed Prospectuses, containing the names and addresses of nearly seven hundred shareholders, rates of premium, an explanation of the system now originated, together with useful information and statistics respecting Life Assurance, may be had on application at the offices.

Parties desirous of becoming Agents or Medical Referees are requested to communicate with the Secretary.

By order of the Board, THOMAS H. BAYLIS.  
Offices: 40, Pall-mall, London.

## ELEVENTH REPORT of the DIRECTORS of the COMMERCIAL BANK of LONDON for the year ending 30th of June, 1851.—At AN ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Shareholders, held at the Banking-house, Lothbury, on Tuesday, the 22nd of July, 1851.

Thomas Barnewall, Esq., Chairman.  
William Beresford, Esq., M.P., Deputy-Chairman.  
C. Dickson Archibald, Esq.  
Charles Butler, Esq.  
John Alfred Chowne, Esq.  
William Cooper, Esq.  
J. Alexander Douglas, Esq.  
Charles Hill, Esq.  
Jonathan Hopkinson, Esq.  
Mark Hunter, Esq.  
Edward Oxenford, Esq.  
John Savage, Esq.  
Joseph Thompson, Esq.  
Joseph Underwood, Esq.  
Richard Walker, Esq., M.P.  
Thomas Winkworth, Esq.  
Manager—Mr. Alfred E. Cutbill.  
Solicitors—Messrs. Amory, Travers, and Messrs. Norris and Sons.

The Manager read the advertisement calling the Meeting, and afterwards the following Report:—

The Directors have the pleasure of presenting to their co-proprietors the Eleventh Annual Statement of the Affairs of the Bank.

It will be seen by the annexed balance-sheet, that after making full allowance for bad and doubtful debts, and paying the charges and current expenses of the past year, the net profits amount to £15,551 13s.; out of these profits a dividend at the rate of £6 per cent. per annum for the half year ending the 31st of December, 1850, has been already paid, and the Directors have now to declare a dividend, free from income-tax, for the half year ending the 30th of June, 1851, at the same rate, £6 per cent. After paying such dividend and deducting the rebate of interest upon current bills, and also writing off £5 per cent. (£200) from the item of £1000 annually charged to the Bank premises account, there will remain a balance of £1191 3s. 6d. to be added to the Reserve Fund, thereby increasing this fund to £28,062 17s. 11d.

In compliance with the provisions of the Deed of Settlement, the following Directors, viz. Charles Dickson Archibald, Esq., Thomas Barnewall, Esq., Jonathan Hopkinson, Esq., Edward Oxenford, Esq., retire from office, but being eligible, offer themselves as candidates for re-election.

## COMMERCIAL BANK OF LONDON.

BALANCE-SHEET, JUNE 30, 1851.	
Capital paid up .. .. .	£761,800 0 0
Capital paid up .. .. .	£153,360 0 0
Guarantee Fund invested in Government Securities .. .. .	23,871 14 5
Balance due to the Customers of the Bank .. .. .	764,541 14 3
Balance carried down, after deducting bad and doubtful debts, and paying all charges and current expenses .. .. .	15,551 13 0
<b>CA.</b> .. .. .	<b>£956,325 1 8</b>
Cash in hand, Government Securities, India Bonds, bills discounted, &c. .. .. .	£956,325 1 8
Value of banking premises, fittings, and furniture, at Lothbury and Henrietta-street .. .. .	4000 0 0
<b>DR.</b> .. .. .	<b>£956,325 1 8</b>

Dividend at the rate of six per cent. per annum, for the half-year ending 31st December, 1850, already paid .. .. . £1311 12 0

Dividend at ditto for the half-year ending 30th June, 1851 .. .. . 4570 16 0

Amount written off bank premises account .. .. . 200 0 0

Rebate of interest on current bills carried to profit and loss, new account .. .. . 2378 1 6

Balance carried to the Guarantee Fund, making that fund £28,062 17s. 11d. .. .. . 4191 3 6

**CA.** .. .. . £15,551 13 0

Balance brought down .. .. . £15,551 13 0

The Report and Balance Sheet having been read, it was Resolved unanimously—That the Report and Balance Sheet just read be approved, printed, and circulated amongst the Proprietors.

The Chairman, Thomas Barnewall, Esq., on the part of the Directors, declared a dividend on the paid-up capital of the Company at the rate of £6 per cent. per annum, free from income-tax, payable on and after the 1st of August next.

Resolved unanimously—That the following Directors, viz. Charles Dickson Archibald, Esq.; Thomas Barnewall, Esq.; Jonathan Hopkinson, Esq.; Edward Oxenford, Esq., who go out of office in pursuance of the Deed of Settlement, be re-elected Directors of the Company.

Resolved unanimously—That the thanks of the Meeting be presented to the Directors for their attention to the management of the affairs of the Bank during the past year.

Resolved unanimously—That the thanks of the proprietors be presented to Mr. Alfred Richard Cutbill for his efficient services as Manager.

(Signed) THOMAS BARNEWALL, Chairman.  
Resolved unanimously—That the thanks of the Meeting be presented to Thomas Barnewall, Esq., for his able and courteous conduct in the chair this day.

(Signed) A. R. CUTBILL, Manager.

**COMMERCIAL BANK OF LONDON.**—The Directors hereby give notice, that a DIVIDEND on the paid-up capital of the Company, at the rate of £6 per cent. per annum, for the half year ending June 30, 1851, free from income-tax, will be PAYABLE at the Banking-house, in Lothbury, on and after the 1st of August next.—Dated July 22, 1851.

By order of the Board, A. R. CUTBILL, Manager.

## THE LONDON NECROPOLIS AND NATIONAL MAUSOLEUM COMPANY.

(Provisionally registered under the Act.)  
Capital £250,000, in 25,000 Shares of £10 each.  
Deposit 1s. per Share.

Calls not to exceed £3 per Share, with One Month's Notice.

Archibald Hastie, Esq., M.P.; William John Evelyn, Esq., M.P.

Col. Chatterton, M.P., K.H., Cork-street, Burlington-gardens.  
Francis Dobinson, Esq., New-square, Lincoln's Inn.  
John Gardner, Esq., 18, Queen's-terrace, St. John's-wood.  
C. R. Thompson, Esq., Winchester-house, Old Broad-street.  
W. J. Voules, Esq., barrister-at-law, 5, Pelham-place, Brompton, Deputy-Chairman.

(With power to add to their number.)

ARCHITECT AND SURVEYOR.  
H. E. Abraham, Esq., Arundel Estate-office, Arundel-street, Strand.

BANKERS.  
The London Joint Stock Bank, Princes-street, Mansion-house, and 69, Pall-mall.

SECRETARY.  
Richard Churchill, Esq.

SOLICITORS.  
Messrs. Coombe and Nickoll, 3, Bridge-street, Westminster.  
Alexander Dobie, Esq., 3, Lancaster-place, Strand.

OFFICES OF THE COMPANY.  
16A, GREAT GEORGE-STREET, WESTMINSTER.

An Act having passed in the last Session of Parliament, by which Intramural Interments are, in so far as the metropolis is concerned, permanently prohibited, the public have reason to regret that such legislative interference, the necessity for which is so clearly indicated in the Report of the Board of Health, has not, owing to unavoidable circumstances, been followed up by remedies calculated by their promptitude, vigour, and extent, to give effect to the requirements of the Act.

In this state of suspense and inactivity, the promoters of this Company, feeling that the same spirit of individual enterprise which has effected such grand and beneficial results in the construction of other works of national importance and utility, may be properly and advantageously applied to this comprehensive work of Sanitary Amelioration, have ventured to promulgate their plans, which they confidently trust will be found eminently calculated to give immediate and complete effect to these requirements.

First. By providing a Metropolitan and National Necropolis at such a distance from the Metropolis as public health and convenience require, upon a scale of magnitude commensurate with the annual mortality of a rapidly increasing population, and capable of meeting the exigencies of unwonted visitations of disease.

Secondly. By the selection of a site susceptible of the highest ornamental characteristic adornment, "fulfilling," to use the words of the Board of Health, "all the requisite conditions of situation, distance, surface, soil, and accessibility," and capable of furnishing separate graves for no less than twenty millions of bodies.

Thirdly. By providing an approach to this site for the transmission of the dead, and the conveyance and return of mourners, upon such terms, and under such provisions as will render the performance of the solemn funeral duties, alike delicate, decent, secluded, and economical, without violating "the highway of the river," the resort of most of those who seek relaxation and recreation, mental and corporeal, during all the time when such highly is available, and without mingling the light-hearted and the distressed, the healthy and the victims of disease, the living and the dead, in one indiscriminate voyage.

Fourthly. By the reservation of separate and distinct localities, the whole forming parts of one great and comprehensive cemetery plan, by which the several metropolitan parishes will preserve, not only the individuality of their burial places, but with it that control which will insure economy, seclusion, and propriety in the arrangement of those interments, which have hitherto and still will come under their management.

To effect these objects the Company have obtained two thousand acres of land at Woking Common, on the line of the South-Western Railway, by which it can be approached, from one of the most central and convenient termini in the metropolis, in forty minutes, being less than the time required in most cases to reach the metropolitan cemeteries.

The purchase-money for this land, and of certain alleged interests therein, amounts to the sum of £57,000, with a contingent claim upon the surplus after the payment of all expenses, and of £10 per cent. to the Shareholders.

They have, moreover, made arrangements with the Directors of that Company for the suitable deposit and separate transmission of bodies, and for the conveyance and return of mourners, under circumstances which will enable the Company to present to the public a permanent tariff of charges, not only more economical than those which any other body, not having the advantage of a comparatively inexpensive site, can present, but even below those which now constitute the expenses of interment within the walls.

The statistics of mortality for five years, within the Metropolitan Burial District, show an average of 54,993 deaths, being 1051 weekly, and 181 daily, whilst the existing Suburban Cemeteries are precluded from receiving more than 18,000 corpses annually, leaving no provision for the interment of 36,993 bodies, but in parochial churchyards and private burial-grounds, where the same are allowed to be open.

The sum of One Shilling per Share will be payable on the inscription of the names of the Shareholders on the Register, and the remainder will be called for by instalments, not exceeding £2 each, at intervals not less than three months, with one month's notice; it being one of the peculiar features of this undertaking that the outlay will necessarily be, in a great measure, progressive and only commensurate with the requirements of the public, and with this object the Directors reserve to themselves the power to commence and carry on their works before the full amount of capital is subscribed.

For the prospectus and forms of application for shares, apply to the Secretary, at the Offices of the Company, No. 16A, Great George-street, Westminster; to the Solicitors, Messrs. Coombe and Nickoll, 3, Bridge-street, Westminster; Alexander Dobie, Esq., 2, Lancaster-place, Strand; or to Messrs. Hichens and Harrison, Stock and Share Brokers, 18, Threadneedle-street, City.

RICHARD CHURCHILL, Secretary.

FORM OF APPLICATION FOR SHARES.

To the Directors of the London Necropolis and National Mausoleum Company.

Gentlemen,—I request that you will allot me Shares, of £10 each, in the above-named Company, and I undertake to accept the same or such less number as you may appropriate to me, to sign the necessary Deeds when required, and pay the Deposit of One Shilling per Share and the Calls as made.

Dated this day of 185

Signature .....

Name in full .....

Profession or business .....

Residence in full .....

Reference .....

Address of Referee .....

## NEW WORKS.

JUST PUBLISHED,  
LECTURES ON POLITICAL ECONOMY.

By FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN,  
Author of the "History of the Hebrew Monarchy," "The  
Soul," "Phases of Faith," &c.  
Post 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

By the same Author,

PHASES OF FAITH, OR PASSAGES FROM  
THE HISTORY OF MY CREED.

Post 8vo., cloth, 6s.

THE SOUL: HER SORROWS AND HER  
ASPIRATIONS.

An Essay towards the Natural History of the Soul, as the Basis  
of Theology.

Post 8vo., cloth 6s.

HISTORY OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY,  
From the Administration of Samuel to the Babylonish  
Captivity.

8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN ASPECTS OF FAITH AND  
DUTY.

Discourses by JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A.  
Post 8vo., cloth, 7s. 6d.

## THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM;

Its Foundations and Superstructure.  
By WILLIAM RATIBONE GREG.  
8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

Contents:—Inspiration of the Scriptures—Authorship and  
Authority of the Pentateuch and the Old Testament Canon  
generally—The Prophecies—Theism of the Jews Impure and  
Progressive—Origin of the Gospels—Fidelity of the Gospel  
History—The Limits of Apostolic Wisdom and Authority—  
Miracles—Resurrection of Jesus—Is Christianity a revealed  
religion?—Christian Eclecticism—The Great Enigma.

A Second Edition, with Explanatory Preface.

THE NEMESIS OF FAITH.  
By J. A. FROUDS, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.  
Post 8vo., cloth, 6s.
LETTERS ON THE LAWS OF MAN'S  
NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT.

By H. G. ATKINSON and HARRIET MARTINEAU.  
Post 8vo., cloth, 9s.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CORIN-  
THIANS:

An Attempt to convey their Spirit and Significance,  
By the Rev. JOHN HAMILTON THOM.  
Post 8vo., cloth 9s.

## NEW AMERICAN BOOKS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN AS-  
SOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT  
OF SCIENCE.

Fourth Meeting held at New Haven, Connecticut, August, 1850.  
Containing papers by Professor Adams, Araxsis, Burnett, Bache,  
Erin, Espy, Gibbs, Henry, Horsford, Johnson, Jewett, Loomis,  
Mitchell, Olmsted, Page, Sullivan, Lieutenant Davis, Dr. Gould,  
Dr. Jackson, C. Girard, E. G. Squier, &c. &c. With Maps and  
Plates.  
1 vol. 8vo., cloth, pp. 414. 16s.

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL  
SOCIETY:

Containing Memoirs, Translations, Vocabularies, and other  
works relating to the Asiatic, African, and Polynesian lan-  
guages.  
Vols. 1 and 2, 8vo., cloth, 35s.

AMERICAN ARCHEOLOGICAL RE-  
SEARCHES.

No. 1. THE SERPENT SYMBOL;

And the Worship of the Reciprocal Principles of Nature in  
America.  
By E. G. SQUIER, A.M.  
1 vol. 8vo., numerous woodcuts, pp. 254, 12s. 6d.

TREATISE ON THE LAW OF THE PRO-  
TESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN  
THE UNITED STATES.

By MURRAY HOFFMAN, Esq.  
1 vol. 8vo., cloth, pp. 480. 14s.

## TREATISE ON DIVINE UNION;

Designed to point out the intimate Relations between God and  
Man in the higher forms of religious knowledge.

By THOMAS C. UHAM, D.D.  
1 vol. 8vo., pp. 435. 7s.

## CAUSE AND CURE OF INFIDELITY;

Including a Notice of the Author's Unbelief, and the means of  
his rescue.  
By the Rev. DAVID NELSON.  
1 vol. 12mo., 5s.

## WORKS OF HORACE.

With English Notes, for the use of Schools and Colleges.

By J. L. LINCOLN,

Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in  
Brown University.

1 vol. 8vo., pp. 575. 8s.

THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY, AND ITS  
CONNECTED SCIENCES.

By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D.D., LL.D.,

President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology  
and Geology.

1 vol. 8vo., pp. 511. 7s.

London: JOHN CHAPMAN, 124, Strand.

## NEW WORK BY ALBERT SMITH AND JOHN LEECH.

THE SECOND NUMBER OF

## THE MONTH.

A VIEW OF PASSING SUBJECTS AND MANNERS, HOME AND FOREIGN, SOCIAL AND GENERAL.

By ALBERT SMITH. Illustrated by JOHN LEECH.

Will be published on the 31st instant, price One Shilling.

OFFICE, NO. 3, WHITEFRIARS STREET.

## CHEMICAL RECORD AND DRUG PRICE CURRENT.

The No. for SATURDAY, JULY 26, will contain—

An Editorial article on Mr. Nasmyth's Theory of Light and Heat, which accords with the Mosaic account of Creation—Serial  
articles by M. Joigneaux, on Agricultural Chemistry—By M. Regnault, on Glass-making (profusely illustrated)—Review of the  
Water Question—Professor Johnson, United States, on the Comparative Value of Coals—Professor Forbes, on the Mollusca of the  
Azores—M. Coutigny, on the Spheroidal Condition of Vapours—Review of Patents and of the New Pharmacopœia—and a Copious  
Price Current of Drugs.

Price 5d., stamped 6d.; or, free by post for twelve months, £1 3s., by Post-office order in favour of Richard Radcliffe Pond,  
17, Upper Wellington-street, Strand. May be obtained through all Booksellers and News Agents.

## PART SIXTEEN of HOUSEHOLD WORDS.

A Weekly Journal, designed for the Instruction and  
Entertainment of all Classes of Readers,

CONDUCTED BY CHARLES DICKENS.

Will be published on the 31st inst., price Ninepence. Also,  
THE HOUSEHOLD NARRATIVE OF CURRENT  
EVENTS,

For July, price 2d., or Stamped 3d.

Office, 16, Wellington-street North, and all Booksellers and  
Newsmen.

PAXTON'S FLOWER GARDEN.

On the 31st inst. will be published, price 2s. 6d., No. 18 of

## PAXTON'S FLOWER GARDEN.

By Dr. LINDLEY and JOSEPH PAXTON.

Illustrated with Beautifully Coloured large Plates, and Fine  
Engravings on Wood.

\* The First Volume, handsomely bound in cloth, price £1 13s.,  
illustrated with Thirty-six large coloured Plates, and One  
Hundred and Twenty Woodcuts, is now ready.

Bradbury and Evans, 11, Bouverie-street.

NEW MONTHLY PERIODICAL

BY THE  
AUTHOR OF "THE COMIC HISTORY OF ENGLAND,"  
ILLUSTRATED BY JOHN LEECH.

On the 31st inst. will be published, price One Shilling, with a  
coloured Engraving and numerous Woodcuts by John Leech,

THE FOURTH NUMBER OF

## THE COMIC HISTORY OF ROME,

For the Use and Amusement of Schools and Families.

Bradbury and Evans, 11, Bouverie-street.

On the 31st inst. will be published, price 7d., Part VIII. of

THE COLLECTED EDITION OF THE

## WRITINGS OF DOUGLAS JERROLD,

containing the continuation of

"MEN OF CHARACTER."

\* The First Volume, "ST. GILES AND ST. JAMES," is now  
ready, price 4s. in cloth

"Punch" Office, 85, Fleet-street.

WORKS PUBLISHED BY E. APPELBYARD,  
86, FARRINGTON-STREET, CITY.

Now Publishing, in Penny Weekly Numbers, and Monthly  
Parts at Sixpence, beautifully illustrated,  
THE PERILS OF THE OCEAN! Being Authentic Narra-  
tives of Remarkable and Affecting Disasters upon the Deep;  
also Wonderful and Daring Adventures by Land. Nos. 1 to  
6 are now ready: also Part I.

THE WANDERING JEW, 86 Engravings . . . 2 0

THE MYSTERIES OF PARIS, 53 Engravings . . . 4 0

ATAR-GULL, and PAULA MONTI, 19 Engravings . . . 2 0

MARTIN THE FOUNDLING, 54 Engravings . . . 4 0

THE WIDOW'S WALK, 19 Engravings . . . 2 0

THE SLAVE KING, 17 Engravings . . . 2 6

THE SIN OF M. ANTOINE, 11 Engravings . . . 2 6

OTTAWAH, 31 Engravings . . . 2 6

THE BASTARD OF MAULEON. By Alex. Dumas, . . . 2 6

35 Engravings . . . 1 0

CALCULUS, THE TURFITE'S COMPUTER. . . 0 6

BARLOW'S NIGGER MELODIST, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and . . . 0 6

4th Series, post-free, 10 penny stamps each . . . 0 6

HELPS TO MEMORY. Being Questions and answers . . . 1 6

in every Department of Human Knowledge . . . 1 6

LIVES OF THE MOST CELEBRATED ACTORS AND . . . 4 0

ACTRESSES. By T. S. Marshall, Esq., with their Por- . . . 5 0

traits by John Gilbert, Esq. . . . .

THE TAILOR'S TUTOR, with 18 Plates . . . 0 6

THE COMPLETE READY RECKONER, from One . . . 0 6

Farthling to One Pound . . . 0 6

AMERICAN RECITATIONS. Post-free, 10 penny stamps . . . 0 6

W. WARDE'S COMIC SONGS. Post-free, 10 penny stamps . . . 1 0

MANLY BEAUTY . . . 3 6

LIFE IN PARIS . . . 2 0

PRIDE; or, THE DUCHESS . . . 3 6

MEMOIRS OF A PHYSICIAN . . . 2 6

THE FORTY-FIVE GUARDSMEN . . . 1 6

THE COMMANDER OF MALTA . . . 1 6

32 PLATES to illustrate the Cheap Edit. of N. Nickleby . . . 1 6

BLACK TULIP. By Dumas . . . 1 0

HOUSEHOLD LIBRARY; or, Guide to Domestic . . . 2 0

Happiness . . . . .

WORKS TO BE HAD IN PENNY NUMBERS.

THE WANDERING JEW . . . complete in 70 Numbers.

THE MYSTERIES OF PARIS . . . " 30 "

ATAR-GULL and PAULA MONTI . . . " 47 "

MARTIN THE FOUNDLING . . . " 35 "

THE BASTARD OF MAULEON . . . " 43 "

LIFE IN PARIS . . . " 22 "

PRIDE; or, THE DUCHESS . . . " 43 "

MEMOIRS OF A PHYSICIAN . . . " 30 "

THE FORTY-FIVE GUARDSMEN . . . " 14 "

THE COMMANDER OF MALTA . . . " 10 "

THE BLACK TULIP . . . " 10 "

TALES OF ALL NATIONS now Publishing in Penny Numbers.

All the above Works are always in Print in Numbers or Com-  
plete Copies, and are well printed on Fine Paper, with Beautiful  
Illustrations, and can be had by Order of any Bookseller in  
Town or Country.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

In 1 vol., crown 8vo., cloth, 16s.,

## A B D E L K A D E R.

A Poem, in Six Cantos.

By Viscount MAIDSTONE.

"Every man who wishes well to human nature—every man  
who prizes liberty above life—every man, in short, who would  
honour generosity and reward virtue, will read this work of  
Viscount Maidstone."—*Observer*.

"It exhibits fertility of imagery and generosity of sentiment;  
much fluency and music in the diction."—*Spectator*.

On the 28th instant will be published, crown 8vo.,  
cloth, 8s. 6d.,

## ERNEST MALTRAVERS.

By Sir EDWARD BULWER LYTTON, Bart.

New and Cheap Edition, corrected and revised, with a  
Frontispiece.

Just published, 8vo., sewed, 2s. 6d.,

THE THREE ERAS OF OTTOMAN  
HISTORY;

A political Essay on the late Reforms of Turkey, considered  
principally as affecting her position in the event of a war  
taking place.

By JAMES HENRY SKERKE, Esq.

London: Chapman and Hall, 193, Piccadilly.

EDUCATIONAL WORKS BY MR. HUGO REID.

To be had of all Booksellers.

## THE STEAM-ENGINE. Third Edition.

4s. 6d.

THE ELEMENTS OF ASTRONOMY. Second  
Edition. 3s.

THE ELEMENTS OF PHYSICAL GEOGRA-  
PHY. 1s.

"The most copious, the best arranged, the most compact and  
manageable treatise we have seen on the subject."—*Educational  
Times*.

THE FIRST BOOK OF GEOGRAPHY. 1s.

"One of the nicest little books on geography which has come  
under our notice. Well suited, not only for young beginners  
at home or at school, but for adults also, by whom the subject  
of geography has been neglected."—*Quarterly Educational  
Magazine*.

Shortly will be published, price to Subscribers 3s., to Non-  
Subscribers 4s.,

## KOSSUTH, AND THE MAGYARS OF OLD.

PROSPECTUS.

Many works have been recently published upon the Hungarian  
war of self-defence, but none of them have thrown any light upon  
the sanguinary events of our ancient history, from 1527, under  
the Government of the House of Habsburg, which serve to ex-  
plain the present.

The illustrious patriots, Bethlen, Botkay, Tüköly, Francis,  
and George Rákóczy have waged many a war, and fought battles,  
in order to secure political and religious freedom.

No author has undertaken to set forth the relations of Hungary  
to the provinces of Austria. Hence the impos-  
sibility of obtaining a clear insight into the sanctity of our outraged  
rights. The public know only the glory of our hard-fought  
battles, and sad downfall of our country's cause. The Magyar  
fought like the lioness, he fought for self-defence, and not for  
revolution; yet he was accused by the followers of the House of  
Habsburg of high treason, and he met with the mercy which  
wild beasts show their prey. The Magyar fought and bled, not  
for new and immature ideas, nor for exclusive privileges, but in  
a holy struggle against the House of Habsburg seeking to trample  
under foot the rights of the nation, and to annihilate the con-  
stitution of a thousand years, derived from the ancient dynasty  
of Arpad. The Magyar protested against the imposition of an  
absolute government. He defied tyranny, and sacrificed for  
liberty and the common weal 80,000 of the noblest children of  
the soil.

The soul of my assassinated country summons me,—the in-  
nocent blood of many thousands of my brethren cries to me from  
the grass upon their graves, and calls upon me to enlighten the  
world, and all true friends of a free people, on the cause of their  
death. In the Appendix will be found a narrative of the adven-  
tures of Kossuth after his retreat into Turkey. This duty I have  
endeavoured to fulfil in my work.

The fate of my unhappy fatherland ought to be a warning and  
a lesson to all free people unremittently to defend their rights,  
and to struggle for every handful of their native soil against  
tyranny, and despotism, which merit to be hated by every upright  
man.

J. SZEREDY.

Every friend of right is solicited to promote this undertaking  
by obtaining Subscribers, and to send the List of Subscriptions,  
by the 1st of August, to Mr. THOMAS HUNT, at the Office of  
the *Leader*, 10, Wellington-street, Strand, London.

London: Printed by ROSS & PALMER (of No. 3, Chesham-terrace, in the  
Parish of Kensington, Middlesex), at the Office of Robert Palmer and  
Joseph Clayton, No. 10, Crane-court, Fleet-street, in the Parish of St.  
Dunstan-in-the-West, in the City of London; and published by JAMES  
CLAYTON, jun., of and at the Publishing-office, No. 25, Strand, in the  
Parish of St. Clement Danes, in the City of Westminster.—SATURDAY,  
July 26, 1851.